A MANIFESTE

DETECTION OF THE notable falſhed of that part of John Frithes boke, which he calleth his foundacion, And boſteth it to be inuincible: newly ſet foorthe by John Gwinneth Clerke.

LONDINI.

1554.

30. f. 20.

A. p. 175. WHo. 457

BIBLIOTHECA · BODLEIANA

Capitulo. 1.



CATHOLICVS, Ah rostrey man, thou art I perceiue, a good riser in a morning, for I thought little to finde thee here so soone. HERETICVS, Sir, if you had slepte this night no more then I did, ye wolde haue bene here perchaunce as soone as I. CATH. why, thou seest I keepe myne houre, and somewhat afore. HER. No sir, that I dare saie ye dooe not. For eyght of the clocke was your houre. And nowe it is almoste nyne, or nyne all together, if it bee not more. CATH. Not of any clocke in London I am sure. HERE. Maie then are ye well, if ye truste to the clockes of London. CATH. Why not? HERE. Ye knowe right well, thei neuer agree together. And therfore we may be sure, thei goe not trewe. CATH. Then bee they wonderfull like vnto heretikes: and nothyng so euill to bee trusted as thei bee: whiche dooe alwaie deceiue, as the clockes dooe not. for there is fewe or none of the clocks, but are sometyme in trewth, and so are theretikes neuer, as thou maiest well perceiue, by that I said yesterdaie, if thou beare it in mynde. HERE. Well syr, I praie you, let all that passe, and nowe to the purpose we come for. CATH; Ye but firste tell me how it chaunsed, that thou slepteste no better to night. HERE. Shall I therin be playne? CATH. What els? HERE. In very deede it was euen longe of you. CATH. Of me? how so? HERE. Ye gaue me suche a banket to bedwarde yesternight, at our partynge, as hath not a litle troubled my head euer sence. CATH. What was

that? HERE. Euen the same that ye sayd of myne olde frende John Frith. CATH. What saied I of hym? HERE. Ye saide he was as subtill, sooliſhe, and falſe as euer was any man, that ye haue redde or herde of. CATH. And calleſt thou that, a banket to bedwarde? HERE. I maie so call it well enoughe. for it was and yet is vnto me, a bitter banket in dede. CATH. Why so? HERE. Ye will not thinke howe muche it greueth me, to here hym so reported? CATH. Then conſider therwith ageyn, howe little it will greeue thee, to here hym so proued. HERE. How little? Maie how muche ye maie saie. CATH. How muche? thou woteſt nere what thou saieſt. For wilt thou bee moze greeued, with the dewe proſe, then with thonly reporte of his falſhed, by whom thou art not a litle deceiued? when, for all the reporte, thou maieſt yet remayne, other in doubte, or cleane out of credence therof, and so be deceiued ſtille, where as by the dewe proſſe, thou maieſt bee certaine and ſure, and no longer deceiued, excepte thou wilt thy ſelfe. And therfore with the reporte, thou canſt not bee so muche greued, as with the dew proſſe thou oughteſt to be glad and well pleaſed. HERE. No syr not so. For although I do here my frende euill reported, yet becauſe the reporte maie chaunce to be falſe, it can not greue so muche, as the dewe proſſe therof, whiche dooeth aſſure me, that it is trewe. Wherfore the proſſe muſt nedes be moze greuous, then the reporte, if I take it right. CATH. That is in reſpect of hym, and not of thy ſelfe, that is to saie, for his sake, and not for thine owne. To bee sozy for thy neighbours falſhed, in that he ſhulde chaunce to bee one of that sorte, is very well doone, whether thou haue it by proſe, or reporte other. But of the

other

other side, as touchyng thin owne parte, to bee sozy soz that thou art by a deiwe pzoke bzought to the knowlage therof, were mozе then extreme foolischneſſe: sith by that, thou canſt take no maner of hurte, but rather the great commoditee of eſcappynge all ſuche diſpleaſure as might chaunce to enſue of the contrarie. And therfoze what other thynge is it, not to be gladde to knowe the falſhede of a deceiuer, But euen to be wilfully and wozthily deceiued, as many a one is? And therfoze if thou be one of that sozte, whiche are so greeued with the repozte of Frithes falſhed, that thei can not bee pleaſed with the deiwe pzoke therof, it will be as harde soz the, as it is soz them, to take any pzofite of the beſte pzobacion that is therof possible to bee made: whiche vnto them is farre inſufficient, and nothyng wozthe. HERE. Why so? CATH. Because of their owne obſtinate wilfulneſſe, whiche is the directe enemie and greatteſt reſiſter of all trewthe: and therfoze moſte incurable of all euils: Wherfoze if I wiſte, that thou were one of them in dede, I wold euen now bidde the farewell, and talke no mozе with thee. Foz if I did, my labour were therin but loſte. HERE. Syz ye ſhall not finde me a refuſer of reaſon. CATH. And thou ſhalt not fynde me an offerer of any other. HERE. Then I meruell howe ye wyll diſcharge your ſelfe of this that ye ſaie, Frith was ſo ſubtill, fooliſhe, and falſe? CA. Foz that purpoſe I ſhall finde matter enough, and it were but in that parte of his wozke, whiche he dooeth call the foundacion of his treatiſe, wherin he thinketh him ſelfe ſo ſtrong and moſte ſure. HERE. What he ſaith therin, I remember very well. And therfoze I wyll ſhewe you ſome parte therof. CATH. Nonot yet, foz I will

make the first recitall my selfe: And therin tell me, whether I dooe it trewly or no. HERE. And euen so will I, by your leue. CATH. I am well content with all. HERE. Whether ye be or not, I will be so bolde at this time. CATH. I know it to be a parte of thy profession, to lacke no boldnesse. HERE. I maie be bolde in my frendes cause.

Capitulo. 2.

CATH. Spare not, and therfore take hede, and harken well to it. For in the preface, and firste lefe of his booke, where he maketh mencion of a brother of his (not a brother of consanguinitee, but a brother of his religious fraternitee) his owne wordes be these.

> This brother (he seith) after muche communicacion: desyred to know my mynde, as touchyng the sacrament of the bodie and bloud of our sauiour Christe, whiche thynge I opened vnto hym accordynge to the gifte that god had geuen me. First I proued vnto hym, that it was none article of our feith necessarie to bee beleued vnder peine of damnacion: Then I declared, that Christe had a naturall bodie. &c.

Nowe for so muche, thou herest what he saith. HERE, I will not denie, but those be his owne wordes in dede: CATH. And in these wordes, thou seest playne, that he saith the sacrament of the bodie and bloude of our sauiour Christe, is none article of our feith necessary to be beleued vnder paine of damnacion. HERE. All that I graunte. CATH. Therfore if it bee not vnder the peine of damnacion, I aske of hym vnder what peine then: he will not saie vnder any peines of purgatorie, whiche he dooth vtterly denie, saiyng ther is none suche: And any other peines after this lyfe, beside any of those two, there is to our knowlage vtterly none. Therfore

what

what so euer he saith, none other he meaneth, but that it is none article of our faithe necessarie to be beleued, vnder any peine at all: HER. Naie sir not so, for he wolde not speake it as he doothe, excepte he mente vnder some peine. CA. Vnder what peine is that? HE. Vnder the peine of suche lawes, as be made & ordeined for it here in this life. CA. And wel said, for if he ment not that, plaine it is, that he mente (as I saide) none at all. But how cowld he meane that, when he accompteth al those lawes nothyng els, but euen the very cruell tyrannie of men, whom he calleth prowde prelates and furious tyrannes of malicious mindes, and vengeable hertes, as it appereth in the. xiii. and. xv. lefe of his booke? And therfore he wolde that men shulde in no wise folowe them, but rather die, then obeie them. HERE. How knowe you that? CATH. By nothyng better, then his owne acte: For euen so did he hym selfe. HERE. Yet his death dooeth shew, that he was bounde vnder that peine. For els he had not died. CATH. Take hede what thou saiest, for alchough his death dooth shewe, that he was bounde at the least vnder that peine: yet it dooth not shewe, that he so tooke it for all that: But it dooth shew clerely the contrarie: For if he had thought hym selfe bounde to beleue it, he wold neuer haue chosen rather to die, then to graunt it, for he was not so madde (although he were madde enough, and to madde in dede) as to chose his owne death, rather then to stande to that, whiche he thought hym selfe he was bound to. Therfore that he chose rather to suffer death, then to graunt hym selfe, or any man els, bounde to beleue it: doth moste clerely proue and shewe, that he ment it no article of our feith to bee beleued, vnder any maner of peyne:

But to be so free, & at so great libertee, that he thought it better to die (as he did in deede) then to graunt it, or to be in any wise bounde vnto it.

Capitulo. 3.

HERE. Then if he ment, vnder no peynes at all, why did he saie, vnder the peine of damnacion, secludynge no mo peines, but onely that? CATH. He did it, either because he could not tell therin, how to expresse his mynde but foolyshely, or els because he durst not russhe it euen all out plainly. And yet thought to wrappe it in his wordes so craftily, that his aduersaries should not take hym with the open faute directly, nor his frendes beleste ignorant of his meanyng, if thei weighed the sequele of his wordes throughly. Wherfore sith it is clere, that he wolde haue this sacrament none article of our feithe, to bee beleued vnder any peine at all, what followeth, or what other thinge is it, but that he wolde haue no man bounde to beleue it? For vnder no peyne, and then vnder no bonde. And vnder no bonde, then at our free libertee. And there he wolde haue it, as it dooeth well and plainly apere. Therfore now let vs see the depe lernyng of this wise man, wherby he hath drawen so many disciples after hym, as he hath done: first if we be not bounde to beleue it, why is it an article of our feithe? for an article of our feith he dooth confesse it, as it apereth in the .xxvi. lefe of his booke, where his owne wordes be these:

> Though it be (he saith) an article of our feith, it is none of our crede in the .xii. articles, whiche are sufficient for our saluacion.

HERE.

Capitulo. 4.

HERE. Marry sir this dooeth open all the matter? CATH. How so? HE. He saith it is an article of our feith, but yet it is none of our Creede in the xii. articles. CATH. A, very well, and therfore we are not bounde to beleeue it? a blessed doctrine: It is likewise none article of our Creede in the. xii. articles nother (as he dothe take them) that euer Christe preached or taught a monges the Iewes. Therfore we are not bounde to beleue it: It is none article of our Creede in the .xii. articles nother, that Christe had .xii. Apostles, or that there was any suche Peter or Paule, as we speake of, or that our Lady liued after the death of Christe. And therfore we are not bounde to beleue it. HERE. Yes syr, for all those thynges apere playne in the gospell, and therfore we are bounde to beleue them. CATH. I tell thee, the gospell it selfe, is none article of our Creede, in the. xii. articles nother. And therfore, we are not bounde to beleue any more of that, then dooth apere in the. xii. articles of the Crede, if we beleue Frith, as to many dooe: wherfore, is not this a gaie teacher, that wold so shut & locke vp our feithe within the. xii. articles of our Crede, that we nede not beleue any of these thinges, nor many mo besyde, as great as these be? And furder more, If this sacramēt be an article of our feith, and we not bounde to beleue it, why is it a sacrament? HERE. Because Christe hym selfe did so institute it. CA. Then by Frithes doctrine, we are not bounde to beleue Christ? own institutiō, when that, which, our sauiour Christ did institute, is left at our libertee to choose whether we wil beleue it or no, as Frith doth holde it is. And therfore is ther any mā, but only Frith, & his adherent?

rent? that wolde thinke our sauiour Christe to institute any article of our feith so, that we might chose (without parill) whether we will alowe it or no? we dooe not alowe it, if we dooe not beleue it: and we neede not beleue it, if we be not bound to it: and we are not bounde to it, if it be vnder no peine. it is vnder no peine saieth Frithe. HERE. Vnder no peine of damnacion he saith. CATH. Vnder no peine at all he meaneth. But neuertheless let it so be, as thou saiest in his most fauour, And yet that waie, because there is no bond (as he saith) vnder that peine: we may at that gappe, (as close as thou kepest it) without any parill of damnacion (after his minde) cleane thrust out the credence and alowance of this holy sacrament, notwithstandinge that it is of the very ordinaunce and institucion of our sauiour Christe him selfe. Therfore how dooeth Frithe handle this matter, but euen as though our sauiour Christe, at his institucion hereof, had saide, Here I leaue it amonge you, chose whether ye will beleue it or no? if he had so said: what might Frithe dooe more, to the fortifying therof, then he dooeth? wherfore sith it is plaine, that our sauiour Christe neuer saide so: Nor yet, as all trewe christen hertes dooe know, neuer ment so: what a thinge is this of Frithe, that he wolde yet make vs beleue so? Farther more, if it be a sacrament, then is it an article of our feith: as bothe the one and the other, Frithe him selfe dooeth confesse and graunte. Therfore if it be an article of our feith: Then the trewth that is in it, must needes be of Christe: for what so euer hath not in it a trewth of Christ, without faile can be no article or part of his feith. Now because a thing can not be beleued or not beleued, but that the trewth therof, muste needes

therin

therin go wythall, Marke what folowth: This artícle (he saieth) we are not bound to beleue: And the trewth of this article, is the trewth of Chriſte. Wherfore we are not bounde to beleue the trewth of Chriſte, if we beleue Frithe. For, to beleue, or not beleue this artícle, without the trewth therof, or the trewth therof, without the article, is not possible, because they be inseperable, and can not be beleued or not beleued, but bothe together: Beside this, if there bee any one of the sacramentes more excellent then other, doubtles this sacrament of the blessed bodie and blond of our saviour Chriſt must nedes be the cheefe. And therfore if we be not bound to beleue this sacrament: plaine it is, that we are not bound to beleue any: for bound to any and bounde to the chiefe: of the other side, not bounde to the cheife, and bounde to none. Therfore what must folow, but, after this doctours mynde, we maie bee bolde, without any parill, to shake hands with them al, and bidde them cleane farre well. As they but late went very nere it, which retained but euen bare two of them. And that was perchante, but euen for a whyle nother. Wherfore, thus thou hast now a sufficiente prose of the firſte stone, that this blynde builder hath layd in his foundacion: whiche is so euell fauordly, and vntrewly wrought, that it can not touch or well lie of any side, but so totteringe and farre out of square, that it can neuer be able to beare any good piece of worke, as euen nowe it maie, and here after shall muche more largely apere. For if a stone well wrought and euill laide, can not make but a shrewed peece of worke: what doeth a stone euill laied and worse wrought, but marre all togeather? Therfore how Frithe laied this

stone (beside his wronge working therof) thou maiest perceiue, was after this sorte: It is a sacrament (he saieth) and an article of our feith, and yet we nede not beleue it: would any man thinke, that it coulde be laied any wors then so? yet to see, whether it will lie any better an other waie, let vs turne it, vpsetdowne. HERE. As how? CATH. Euen thus, If we nede not beleue it, it is none article of our feithe, nor yet no sacramente nother. And therfore, how likest thou the leiynge of it nowe? HERE. It lieth wors this way, then it did before. CATH. That is long of the workemanshipppe. For Frithe wrought bothe, that is to saie, as well the one side as the other: and of the two euill he laide the worste vnderneth out of sight, wherby it might the more easly and sooner deceiue. HERE. How so euer Frithe laied it, yet am I sure, that he neuer so wrought it, as you haue nowe laied it. CATH. How knowest thou that? HERE. Because he nother saieth, we nede not beleue it, nor that it is none article of our feith, nor no sacrament, as ye laie now all three to his charge, but he dooeth saie, the contrary, and that in plaine wordes directly. And therfore the laiyng of it, as ye laie it now is of your owne head, and not of his.

Cap. 5.

CATH. Because thou goest so farre in the matter, dooeth he not saie in plaine wordes, that we are not bound to beleue it vnder peine of damnation? And of that, haue I not proued vnto the, that he meaneth vnder no peyne at all? and therby consequently, that we are not bound. Therfore all this remembred, what other thing is it to say, that we are not bound to beleue it, Then to saie, we nede not beleue it? for we

nede not to dooe, that we are not bonnd to: and what other thing is it to saie, that we nede not beleue it, then to saie, it is none article of our feith? for if it be an article of our feith, we are bounde to beleue it, or els we are not bound to the beliefe of the whole feith, when there is nothing els, that maketh an heretike, but the lacke of some part of it.

Wherfore, if we be bound to the beliefe of the whole feith, we must nedes be bound to the beliefe of this article, whiche is a parte of it, by Frithes owne saiynge. Of the other side, if we be not bound to the beliefe of this article, as he dooeth saie we are not, then it is none article of the feith at all: If it be none article of the feith, then it is no sacrament nother. For all though euery article of our feith be not a sacrament, yet for all that, euery holy sacrament is an article. Therfore why is it called an article of our feith, but because our feith ought so to receiue it? If our feith ought so to receiue it, why dooth Frith saie, we are not bound to beleue it? if we be not bound to beleue it, why dooeth he say, that it is an article of our feith? which he dooeth cleane cutte away againe, in that he saieth, we are not bound to beleue it. Therfore say not (as thou saidst) that I lay this of mine owne head, for I saie herein nothing els, but onely the same, that was in effecte, wrought and conceiued in Frithes head, as it is now proued by an inevitable consequence of his owne woords before recited: wherin, whether he dooe now apere, more foolishe then false, or more false then foolishe, iudge thou, if thou canst: for trew it is, that I can not.

Cap. 6.

HERE. Well sir, yet I pray you here farder of his mynde, and then will I tell you more of mine. CATH. With a good will. HERE. In the seconde leafe of his booke his wordes be these.

„ The foundacion (he saieth) of that little treatise was, that
„ it is none article of our feith necessary to be beleued vn-
„ der peine of damnacion, that the sacrament shuld be the
„ naturall body of Christ: which thing is proued on this
„ maner.

CATH. Softe, stay there awhile: for it is mete and conuenient, that before we entre into the profe of a matter, we shulde first perpende, weigh and consider the matter it selfe, and be certaine therof, leste otherwise, we should goe about to proue, we can not tell what. Therfore the matter (as I take it) is this, that he saith, it is none article of our feithe, necessarie to bee beleued vnder peine of damnacion, that the sacrament shulde be the naturall bodie of Christe. HERE. The same is it. CATH. And this he calleth his foundacion. HERE. All that is treiwe. CATH. Then hath he leid two foundacions. For this and the other before, whiche we haue tried all redie, are not bothe one, but farre vnlike, and differeth muche. for that before was, that the sacrament it selfe, is no article of our feithe necessarie to be beleued. &c. And this nowe is, that it is none article of our feithe necessarie to be beleued, that the sacrament is the naturall bodie of Christe. Wherfore these bee two foundacions. HERE. Sir that same other before, he did not laie for a foundacion. CATH. That is not so, his owne woordes doothe proue the contrarie. For, in satisfyng the requeste of his brother in Christe, as touchyng this sacrament, his owne woordes (thou knowest)

be

be these.

First I proued vnto hym (he saith) that it was none artic-
cle of our feith necessarie to be beleued. &c.

Here thou seest no lesse, but of all that buildyng, this parte he laied firste, as he saith hym selfe. And in all buildynges, that is the foundacion, whiche is first laied. Therfore other he laied that, for a foundacion, or els thou must nedes graunt, that there he builded without any foundacion at all: as the moste foolishe builder neuer dooeth. And therfore although he dooeth not properly name but one foundacion, yet two (as I said) he hath laied for all that, wherof sith we haue tried the one alredie, let me nowe here what proke he maketh of this other:

Capitulo. 3.

HERE. His proke is this:

Firste we muste all acknowlage (he saith) that it is none
article of our feith, whiche can saue vs, nor whiche we
are bounde to beleue vnder the peine of eternall damna-
cion. For if I shulde beleue, that his very naturall bodie
both flesh & blood, were naturally in the bread and wyne,
that shuld not saue me: seing many beleue that, and re-
ceiue it to their dammacion. for it is not his presence in
the breade, that can saue me, but his presence in my herte
through feith in his bloode: whiche hath washed out my
synnes, and pacified the fathers wrath towarde me.
And agayne, if I dooe not beleue his bodely presence in
the bread and wyne: that shall not damne me: but the
absence out of my herte thorough vnbelefe.

Nowe sir, here ye haue herde his proke, what saie ye to it?

CATH. In very dede, with some of his owne woordes, I saie to it this. First we must all acknowlage, that he is the moste subtill, craftie, and wilie solititour of his maisters cause, that euer traueled in this matter, so farre

as I haue redde. For if the diuell hym selfe were incarnate, and so shulde come amonge vs, to see what he coulde dooe againste the faithe of this holy sacramente, what might he inuent or imagine therin, more subtilly, more craftily, and with more wilynesse for the purpose, then this man of his, hath doone alredie? For he dooth not directely denie it a sacrament, he dooth not directly denie it an article of our feith: he doothe not directly denie, that we are bounde to the belefe of it nother: But he goeth anere waie to worke then so. For all these waies, or any of them, he knewe right well, had ben of suche a sorte, to swade at the firste, that men wolde haue ben therin, more redy to spette at hym, then willyng to here hym. Wherfore he thought to begynne an other waie, that is to saie, with no more, but onely the deniall of the peine of damnacion, dewe for the notbeleueinge therof. And that because he considered, how prone, reddie, and gladde all men are, to bee ridde of the perill and daunger of peines, specially the peines of damnacion. And therfore to creepe the more easely into their fauour, he thought to enter with that, whiche thei had moste luste to here: Beyng well assured, that if he preuailed therin (as it semed to him moste like) all the reste of his purpose, should easly folowe: as to playne it is, that it hath doone, in a great sorte. For if I shuld intende to allure thee from the belefe, that Christe was borne of a virgin, how coulde I so craftily, and so easely bryngе it about by any meanes, as by this perswasion, that there is no perill of damnacion therin? For let me once bryngе the out of the feare of that perill, And then, who dooth not see, how easy a matter it were, to bryng the out of thee feare of all other perils, whiche are nothynge in respecte

of

of that, sith thou mightest kepe the from them, with not bewrayyng thy selfe? And when thou arte once therin, throughly ridde and passe the feare of all perils, what case art thou in then, with thy feithe of that article, but euen cleane careles? for no man careth, but for feare of some displeasure that might ensue. Therfore when thou art careles, whether thou beleue it or no, what nede any farder perswasion to moue the from it? specially when the propretee of the thyng is suche, as will neuer abide with him, that careth not for it: for he that careth not for it, setteth nothyng by it. And he ý setteth nothyng by it, other hath lost it, or will not longe kepe it. And therfore, when it is once come to be nothyng set by, To what cometh it farder, but euen to contempte and extreme hatred? wherof there can be no greatter prose, then the lamentable experience therof, to great and openly knowen? For hath not this wilie Reinarde, by the meanes of this his diabolicall perswasion of no perill of damnacion in the lyke case, brought many a one to the same pointe, with this holy sacrament whiche we nowe speake of? as it maie moste plainely apere, by the shamefull approbrious woordes and behauiour of his owne disciples. whiche sticke not, some in the pulpet, and moe in the ale howse, to call it sacke in the bore: A god of. xviiii. a penny: A god of the bakers makyng: A great idoll, a sacrament of the halter, in diriſion of it, and of the holy alter: with such other moste shamefull, both sayyngs and examples, so horrible and odible, as can not but abhorre all good Christen eares to here them. Therfore in this pointe to conclude (as I began) First me muste all acknowlage (if we dooe well) that he is (as I saide) the most wilie, subtill, and craftie solititour of his ma-

ſters cauſe that euer medled in this matter.
Secundarily, we muſt all acknowlage likewiſe, that he is not ſo wilie, ſubtill, and craftie one waie, but that he ſhewth hym ſelfe as fonde, and fooliſhe an other waie, as it dooth partely apere euen nowe, and muche more ſhall here after. For here thou ſeeſt, he taketh vpon him (as a matter of great weight) to proue that, whiche no man learned will denie. HERE. What is that? CATH. That the ſacrament is not the naturall bodie of Chriſte. For who knowth any thynge, and knoweth not that? although it bee commonly called the bodie of Chriſte, as right well it maie for diuers cauſes, whiche here after ſhall well apere. HE. Sir of this folie, I dare well excuſe hym. For although it be knowen to thē that be lerned, that the ſacramēt it ſelfe, is not the very naturall bodie of Chriſt, as it is cōmunely called, yet he doth well to make a proſe of the trewthe therof, for the vnlerned ſake, to whom it is otherwiſe, or not ſo well knowne.

Capitulo. 8.

CATH. Then yet thirdly, we muſt all acknowlage once againe, that it is harde to ſaie, whether he be herein more fooliſhe, or falſe. For plaine it is, that here he doothe promiſe one thynge, and clene omittyng the ſame, gothe aboute to perform an other. HERE. How ſo? CATH. Dooeſt thou not ſee it plaine, that he dooeth here promiſe to proue, that the ſacrament is not the naturall bodie of Chriſte? And for the performance therof, dooſt thou not ſee againe that he goeth a bowte to proue, that the naturall bodie of Chriſte, is not in the ſacrament? As though it were all one to ſaie, that the ſacrament is not the naturall bodie of Chriſte, and to ſaie, that the naturall bodie of Chriſte, is not in the

ſacrament;

ſacrament: Euen as I might ſaie, thy ſowle is not thy bodie, and for to make the beleue the ſame, goe aboute to proue, that thy ſowle is not in thy bodie: as though to be, and to be in, were all one, that is to ſaie, as though to be the howſe, and to be in the howſe, were without any difference. Therfore becauſe Frith, in diuers places of his booke, doubtyng of mens ſightes, dooth ſaie in the fourthe leſe (this might expounde our matter, if men had eies to ſee,) other he him ſelfe, had eies to ſee this muche as I ſaie, or els he had not: If he had not, but ſpake blyndly he wiſte nere what, how fooliſhe dooth he apere? If he had, and ſaw what he did, how plaine falſe dooth he ſhewe hym ſelfe, whiche is farre worſe? wherfore ſith his poſicion and his probacion, are here of ſuch a degeneracion, that thei are without all poſſibilitee, of any agrement to gether, let vs therfore helpe hym to change his poſicion, and frame it ſomewhat acordyng to the pretence of his probacion, to ſee what it will proue then, becauſe it is nothyng to the purpoſe now. HERE. How ſhall we dooe that? CATH. Thou ſeeſt his poſicion in effect is this, that the ſacrament is not the naturall bodie of Chriſte: And his pretẽded probacion rẽneth, not vpon that but vpon this, that Chriſtes naturall bodie is not in the ſacrament. Therfore let his poſicion be euen ſo, to ſee whether his pretended probacion will reache vnto that or no. HE. Yes I doubt not therof? CA. Whether thou do, or not, yet we muſt all acknowlage once againe (as it dooth plainly apere) that he hath in this pretended probacion, brought for him, none authoritee of holy ſcripture, none of olde holy doctors, nor yet ſo muche as any one ſparke of reſon or truth other. For all his great pretence of defẽdyng him ſelfe by thoſe three authoritees, as

it apereth in the thirde and fourtenth lefe of his booke, if thou marketi well. HERE. Yes syr, very good reason he bringeth here, for he saith,

» If I shoulde beleue that his very naturall bodie, bothe
» flesshe and blude: were naturally in the bread and wyne,
» that shuld not saue me, seeynge many beleue that, and
» receiue it to ther damnation.

Now sate ye nowe? CATH. If thou call this good reason, thou hasse but a little witte. For besides, that he doothe here call it breade and wyne, of a spite against the contrarie: as though it were breade and wyne in dede, whiche is most false, as hereafter it shall well apere. And beside his foolishe speakynge in this that he saithe, If I shulde beleue that his very naturall bodie were naturally therin, as who saie, because we doe beleue that Christes very lyuely bodie, is presently and verely in the sacrament, we beleue it to bee therin naturally: when we dooe not beleue it to be so in heauen. And yet we beleue it to bee verely there in dede, for all that. But this man dooeth speake, as though it were alwaie a generall rule, that where so euer any thynge is presently, it wer there also naturally. As who saie, when an arowe is shotte vp in to the aire, it were there naturally, or a bladder blowen full of aire: and conueied by violence downe to the botome of the water, it were there naturally. Or as who saie, when god toke Helias from the societee, and companie of mortall men, and did lifte hym vp into heauen, he passyng through the aire, was there aboue naturally: Beside (I saie) all this, very false, foolishe, and nothyng to the purpose, what is there in it els, whiche doothe prone it none article of our feith, that we are bounde to beleue? For there aboute he go-

eth,

eth. HERE. That many beleue it (he saith) and receiue it to their damnacion. CATH. What meaneth he by that? are we not bounde to beleue it, because thei beleue it. HERE. Naie not therfore. CATH. What then? Because thei receiue it? HERE. No nother. CATH. Then, is it because thei beleue it, and receiue it to? HERE. He meaneth not so nother. CATH. How then? HERE. As Paule saieth, He that eateth and drynketh it unworthily, doothe eate and drynke his owne damnacion. CATH. A then he groundeth hym selfe herein vpon saynt Paule. HERE. What els? CATH. In dede it were els but euen his own dreame, as I wene we shall fynde it neuertheles. Therfore is the cause why, that we are not bounde to beleue it, be nother because thei beleue it: Nor because thei receiue it: nor yet because thei beleue it and receiue it bothe, but because of that, whiche foloweth, that is to saie, to their damnacion. Then, why is it to their damnacion? HERE. For their unworthinesse. CATH. Therfore when Frithes reason is either nothyng, or els this that we are not bounde to beleue it because many receiue it to their damnacion. And thei receiue it not to their damnacion, but because of their unworthinesse, how clerely doothe it folowe, that their unworthines is the cause why, (by his reason) that we are not bound to beleue it? And how madde a witte hath he, whiche will thynke, that any other mennes unworthines can set vs, or on, with the bonde of our beleefe, in any poynte of our feithe? 1.Co.11

Capitulo. 9.

HERE. Sir yet ye take him wronge still. For he doth not mene that their beleuing, or unworthy re-

teining of it to their damnacion, is the cause why, that we are not bounde to beleue it. CA. How then? HERE. He dooth mene no moze, but that it dooeth shewe, that we are not bound to beleue it. CATH. Aha, then it is come from a pzouing, to a shewing, and that full wise: foz that they dooe beleue it, doeth rather shewe, that we be bounde, to dooe so to, rather then the contrarie. HERE. What, when they receiue it to their damnacion? CATH. Yea foz all that: foz why dooe they receyue it to their damnacion: because they beleue it? HERE. Nay that is not his minde nother, foz then he wolde not haue saied, we are not bounde to beleue it. But he wouldе haue saied, we be bound not to belene it. CATH. Therfoze what is this to the purpose of our bond of belieke? If he counde haue pzoued, that suche as dooe not beleue it, were in no daunger therfoze, it had bene then an other matter. But to say, seeing many beleue it: and as who say, therfoze we maie lawfully chose: what noddy wolde so saie oz suppose, but he? HERE. Sir it is not that nother, which Frith intendeth to shew it by. CATH. What then? HERE. That they receiue it to their damnation. CATH. Doth that shew, that we be not bounde to beleue it? HERE. Cleerly me thinke. CATH. Euen as though the bonde of beleuing, were enough to put away, the danger of vnwozthy receiuing: but yet I pzay thee looke better vpon it. And tell me in good erneſt, whether it dooeth not seeme rather to shew, that we be not bound to receiue it, then not bounde to beleue it? HERE. Receiue it? what we be bounde therto, by the plaine wozdes of the gospel. CATH. That I graunt to be trew: And therfoze tell me whether of them both, dooe Frithes wozdes seeme

rather

rather to shew, for although bare wordes of shewing bee farre from the strength of dew proving, yet if there bee any thing in his shewing, that might sound herein ageinst our dewtie of beleving, dowtles it dooeth sound ten times more ageinst our dewtie of receiuing, then ageinst that. And yet betwene the dutie of receiuing, and the deutie of beleuing herein, the difference is such, that vnworthinesse of maners, may and ought for the time, exclude the dewtie of receiuinge: But so it can neuer doe the deutie of beleuinge at any time. Wherfore in this much, hitherto, we haue found, vnder the onely pretence of a great worthy prouinge, nothinge els in deede, but his onely bare, leane, and naked saiyng, without reason, trewth, wit, or learning.

Cap. 10

HERE. Pe but yet ye muste take that foloweth with all, and then indge as ye see cause. For ye know he addeth vnto it this,

It is not his presence (he saieth) in the bread, that can saue me, but his presence in my hert through feithe in his bloud, which hath washed out my sinnes, and pacified the fathers wrath towarde me.

Now sir weigh this and the other together. CATH. Nay the other we haue weighed well enough alredie And therfore what shall we weigh in this, but that it is none article of our feith, which we are bounde to beleue vnder paine of damnation, that the very bodie of our saviour Christ is presently in heauen? HERE. I merualle that ye will so say. For Frith hath here no such wordes. CATH. No, it is enough for him so to teach, although it bee in other wordes. For when he doth saie it is not his presence in the bread, that can saue hym, what dooeth he els intende, but therby to proue

that we are not bound to beleue it? HERE. That I graunt. CATH. And dooeth it not euen as muche against our beliefe of his very bodily presence in heauen? HERE. I thinke not. CATH. Then harken well what I shall say, for the selfe same wordes, that he speaketh here, of Christes bodely presence in the sacrament, I will speake of his bodily presence in heauen, and then tell me thy selfe, whether it be as I say or not. HERE. With a good will. CATH. Then this. It is not his presence in heauen, that can saue me: But his presence in my herte, through feith in his blonde, whiche hath washed out my sinnes, and pacified the fathers wrath toward me. Wherfore it is none article of our feith, which we are bound to beleue vnder peine of damnacion. How saiest thou to it now? HERE. I saie the plaine wordes of the scripture doe binde vs therin to the contrary. CATH. And therfore I saie, the plaine wordes of the scripture is against this, which Frith dooeth teache. And for a more clere vnderstandinge therof, when he saieth, it is not his presence in the breade, that can saue me, but his presence in my heart thorow feyth in his blond, and therof wold haue it folow, that it is none article of our feith, which we are bounde to beleue vnder peine of damnation, I aske no more of him, but what of his presence vpon the Crosse? what of his presence in the Sepulcre? what of his presence among his disciples? what of his presence now in heauen? with his presence in many cases moe? doest thou not clerely see, that this lesson of his doth renne directly euen as wel against the beliefe of al these, as against the belife of his presens in this holie sacrament? Therfore if his seiyng make any thing against this, it maketh as much against al the rest: If it

make

make nothing againſt al the reſt, then it maketh nothing againſt this: HERE. Sir the preſence of theſe things, that ye ſpeake of, are all gone and paſſe, ſauyng his preſence in heauen. CATH. Ye but the ſeithe and beleſe of them all amonge vs, is nother gone nor paſſe, for we ſtande bownde to that neuertheleſſe. And that is it, whiche Frithe attempteth to oppugne and ouerthrowe. And therfore what ſo euer he doothe (as I ſaide) againſt the beleſe of one of theim: without faile he dooth againſt the beleſe of them all. HERE. Sir ye maie make of euery mans tale what he luſte, if ye bee ſo diſpoſed. CATH. Why ſaieſt thou ſo. Thou maieſt eaſely perceiue, that I make none other of his tale, then therof muſt I nedes folowe. And therfore where he goeth farder and ſaieth of the contrarie parte.

If I dooe not beleue his bodily preſence in the breade and wyne: that ſhall not damne me, but the abcence out of my herte through vnbeleſe.

Looke nowe thy ſelfe, if he might not as well haue ſaid, If I dooe not beleue his bodily preſence in heauen, that ſhall not damne me, but the abſence out of my herte through vnbeleſe? How ſaieſt thou? Is it not well proued of hym, that Chriſtes bodily preſence in the ſacrament, is none article of our feith, whiche we are bounde to beleue vnder peine of damnacion, when he proueth vtterly by the ſame reaſon (as he did before) euen as muche and no leſſe of his bodily preſence in heauen? But where he ſaithe, If he dooe not beleue it, that ſhall not damne hym, how will he proue that? or why dooth he not ſo muche as pretende or ſeme to goe aboute it? But without faile, becauſe his heretical lie therin, is ſo great, that it will with no maner of thyng be couered, but one-

ly with his fals feith, whiche hideth it from hym, and suche other as he is, and from no man els. And therfore I praie thee, marke well what he saith immediatly folowyng in the same lefe for his woordes be these,

» Now if they wold here obiecte (he saith) that though it be
» trewth, that the abcence out of the bread could not damne
» vs: yet are we bound to beleue it: because of gods woorde,
» which who beleueth not: as muche as in hym lieth, ma-
» keth god a lier. And therfore of an obstinate minde not to
» beleue his woorde, maie bee an occasion of damna-
» tion.

How saiest thou? dost thou not see what a fooliche phantasticall obiection he hath here feigned of our behalfe? as though we wold hold and obiecte, that the absence out of the bread (as he calleth it) were a trewth, when that is his parte, & not ours. For he plaieth that parte him selfe, & so do not we, but the contrarie. And againe, as though we wold obiect, that we are bounde so to beleue it, & that by gods woorde: but where or which of gods woordes that is, he telleth vs not. Wherfore this proper obiectiō, of his madde phantasticall feignyng, I will passe ouer, lest I shuld with more talke, rather hied, then disclose the foolishnes of it. And therfore beholde it well thy selfe, for I leue it vnto thee, euen as it is, because it appereth more fooliſh of it selfe, then I can declare with all I can saie. And yet because his solucion therof, dooth answere it so well, as though thobiectiō it selfe had neuer bene imagined, thou shalt here it, to thintent thou maiest perceiue, what a colour he dooth caste vpon the matter, vnder the onely pretence of an answere, and nothyng els.

» To this we maie answere (he saith) that we beleue gods
» woorde, and knowlage that it is trewe: but in this we
» dissent, whether it be trewe in the sense that we take it
» in, or in the sence, that ye take it in: and we saie agayne

that

that though ye haue (as it appereth vnto you) the euident
woordes of Christe, And therfore consiste in the barke of
the letter: yet are we compelled by the conferryng of the
scriptures to gether within the letter, to serche out the
minde of our sauiour. which spake the woordes. And we
saie thirdly, that we doe it not of an obstinate minde. For
he that defendeth a cause obstinately (whether it be trew
or false) is euer to be reprehended. But we doe it to satis-
fie our consciences, whiche are compelled by other places
of scripture, reasons, and doctours so to iudge of it. And
euen so ought you to iudge of your partie, and to de-
fende your sentence not of obstinacie, but by the reason
of scriptures, whiche cause you so to take it, and so
oughte neither partie to dispise other. For eche seketh
the glorie of god: and trewe vnderstandynge of the
scripture.

I doubt not, but here thou seest a wonderfull charitee in
this man, whiche swadeth so sore, to suche a concorde to
be had betwene trewth and falshed, that he wolde haue
neither partie despise other: for eche (he saith) seketh the
glorie of god, & the trew vnderstandyng of the scripture.
And therfore I woulde yet knowe of hym, when, or
where, that partie shoulo finde the glorie of god, and the
trewe vnderstandyng of the scripture, whiche seeketh it
in falshed? HERE. what speake you of that, when Frith
meaneth no suche partie? CATH. Wilt thou saie so?
is not that one of the parties, that Frith speaketh of,
which holdeth with Christ̃ bodily presence in the sacra-
ment, and that to be beleued vnder peine of damnation,
and the other, which holdeth directly the contrarie? And
therfore if the one be trew, the other must nedes be false:
yet eache (he saieth) seketh the glorie of god, and the
trew vnderstandynge of the scripture: And I saie then,
the one in trewthe, and the other in falshed, speede as
they can, for so it is, when they be in two directe contra-

Math. 7. ries. But where our sauiour Christ saieth vnto vs, Querite, & inuenietis, that is to saie, seeke and ye shall find, although he ment therin none other thing, then appertaigneth to the glorie of god, and the trew vnderstandynge of the scripture, yet because he did not there apoynt vs directly with apert and speciall wordes, wherin we shulde seeke it, Frith perchaunce toke hym to meane it indifferently, as well in falshead as in trewth. And that maie well bee the cause why, that he for his part, sought the glory of god, & the trew vnderstandinge of the scripture, in falshed: And lefte vs to seeke it in trewth, where withall he would not meddle: how be it litle nede he had so to doe, for therin found we it, longe before. And that is the cause, he liked vs so muche the worse. And therfore yet marke the wilie Raynard, wher about he goeth. HERE. where about? CATH. Euen to bring both the parties to suche an indifferencie, that neither shuld despise other, while his parte might haue a quiet leisure to creepe in, and cleane thrust out the tother: for well he wost, (for all his false dissimulation) that thei coude not continew together. Therfore as touching all the rest of his answere beside, weigh his obiection and that well together: And as in folly and falshed thou shalt not fynd them a sonder. Euen so in any point els, thou shalt not bring them together. wherfore now because we haue hitherto spent some more tyme then neded, in an errour so plaine, and yet not halfe so much, as the foolishe falshed therof wold require, if it shuld be fully declared, looke if he haue ought els, that semeth to the any thing more to maintein or make for his euill purpose then this, bringe it forth, and thou shalt here what I will say to it.

Cap.

Cap. II.

HERE. Me thinke sir, he hath, for all this, in a certeyne place, such a strong reason for his purpose herein, as all the world can not auoyde. CATH. what so euer it be, thou maiest yet, by this that is passe, bee sure of one of these two, that either it is not trew in dede, or els although it be, yet it maketh nothing for hym. HE. By that reason, it can make nothinge for him, whether it by trew or false.. CATH. That can be no lie, for there is no trewth, that can trewly make with falshed. HERE. Yet ye shall here what it is. CATH. With a good will. HERE. In the. iii. leafe of his boke euen these be his wordes,

And first that it is (he saieth) none article of our feith necessary to be beleued vnder peine of damnacion, maie thus be farther confirmed. The same feith shall saue vs, which saued the olde fathers before Christes incarnacion: But they were not bound vnder peine of damnacion to beleue this poynt. Therfore it shall folow, that we are not bound therto vnder peine of damnacion. The first part of mine argument, is proued by saint Austen ad Dardanū: And I dare boldly say, almost in an hundreth places. For there is I thinke no proposicion, whiche he dothmore often inculcat then this, that the same feith shall saue vs, which saued our fathers. The second part is so manifest, that it needeth no probacion: for how could they beleue that thing, which was neuer said nor done; and without the worde they could haue no feith, vpon the treuth of these two partes must the conclusiō nedes folow. Now sir, how say ye to this gere? CATH. Countreiman, as thou saiest, it is perchaunce after the iudgement of some, a great and sore reason. But yet I promise the one thing, it semeth to the no more trew, then it is well known to me, to be very false, specially as he dooth vnderstand it, and as thou shalt find it, if thou her-

ken well to me. And for the sure and perfect triall therof, Thou must first consider this, that Logike is a certaine. HERE, May then we haue it, and ye come in with Logike. OATH. What softe, thou doest interrupt my tale, as though thou mightest not abide the hering of it. HERE. Tushe sir Logyke, what shuld Logike doe here? OATH. A, I know what thou meanest well enough. And therfore hold thy peace a while, tyll I haue tolde the, what I meane. For Logike (I say) is a certaine arte, which doeth teache a compendious waie to discerne the veritee of a thing, from the falsitee, and that can not bee doone, excepte both bee knowen. Therfore among all other things, there is for the purpose inuented a certaine argument, which is made and formed of three partes. And of the which three, the first and the seconde are called in schooles, two propolicions, the more and the lesse. And when those two, in their conuenient kinde be both trew, and trewly knitte together, then the third part, which of them bothe, must needes follow, and is called the conclusion, can neuer be false. And againe, when any of those two propolicions be false, or not trewly knit together, the conclusion, which shuld follow, can by them, neuer be trew. This argument also, when the first part, and the second is trew, wherof their necessarie conclusion must nedes bee trew also, it is called the a Syllogismus. And whe any of the both be false, for the which their intended conclusion, can by them neuer be trew, it is the called a Sophistication. So that betwene Logike and Sophistrie, there is in this case no difference, but vnder one aparent maner and forme, the one holdeth the veritee, and the other the falsitee. Therfore this facultee, art, or cunning of Logike, I dare wel saie,

Logike.

Syllogismus.

Sophistication.

there is no suff louer of trewth, but will iudge it very ne-
cessary to be had, when it is but the suff trial of trewth it
selfe. And yet is it a thing, which in special, some teachers
doe vtterly forbid, and cry out vpon. But that wold they
neuer doe, if their teaching were good & trew. For who
be thei, that teache a doctrine, and forbiddeth their disci-
ples the iudgement of such, as can best skill to discerne
what it is, but onely sals harlotes, which goe about to
deceiue. HERE. Sir wherfore speake you all this?
CATH. Trewly euen for the schoole, that thou art of.
For haue you not brought the name of Logike and phi-
losophie so farre in sclander of subtile and craftie deceite,
among no small sorte of suche as knoweth it not, that
they doe now suspecte, and refuse the iudgement of a
man so much the more, as they thinke or heare tell, that
he is learned therin. But in this your so doting, how
great is your shame, in the iudgement of such, as doue
well perceiue it? And yet how little is all that shame, in
respect of this, that the very same maie well be founde
and proued in you, which ye crie so fore vpon all your
disciples, most cheifly to shunne and beware of in other:
that is to sate, sophisticall subtilitee, as though ye medled
nothing withal your selues, whe ye practise & vse almost
nothing els: And that is the cause why, that ye forbede
your scholers the hering of such as know it, lest by them
they shuld learne to espie and perceiue your faultes,
whiche ye wold haue renne and creepe still in the darke,
vnto the time it might put out all the light.

Capu. 2.

HERETICVS. Sir I pray you geue me
leue, we goe about the triall of Faithes mat-
ter, therfore, what is all this to that purpose?

Cath.

CATH. Doest thou not perceiue? HERE. No trewly. For he neuer vsed any suche thynge as ye speake of. CATH. No did? Shall I nede to reherse vnto thee (whiche doest knowe it so well) how he doothe exclame and crie against sophisters and sophistrie almoste in euery corner of his booke, and yet plaieth none other, but the same parte hym selfe? For inquire thou of any man, that can skill therof, and if he dooe not saie, that this, whiche thou hast now rehersed of Frithes owne woordes, is the selfe same scholastical and sophistical argument, whiche I haue here discribed vnto thee, and is daily vsed in the scholes, take me for no better then (I saie) he is. Now be it, I dooe not meane, that it is the same argument, whiche is daily vsed in schooles, when it holdeth the veritee: but vtterly the same, when it holdeth the falsitee, onely with these two differences, that in the schooles it is put in latine, where he putteth it here in english. And againe there it is but a feigned falshed, to teache men to be ware of it: And here it is an ernest falshed, to teache men to be deceiued with it. And to proue this that I saie to be trewe, First I shall not nede to bid thee, beare his argument wel in minde, which hast here rehersed it vnto me thy selfe. Therfore if thou marke it wel, the whole pith of it, doth rest vpon the saiing of saint Austen, whiche as Frith dooth allege him, is this, (The same feith shall saue vs whiche saued the olde fathers before Christes incarnation) Now if saint Austen had not said, the same feith, but an other feith shall saue vs. &c. it had bene vtterly nothyng for Frithes purpose. Therfore thou maiest playnly see thy selfe, that all the weight of the matter, dooth lie in this woorde. The same. Wherfore let vs now trie further, what maner of woorde

this is, and whether it bee apte to buſlde a good argument vpon, or not. HERE. That is but reaſon. CATH. then tell me trewly, what thynge thou arte. HERE. What thynge am I? what ſhoulde I bee but a man? CATH. And am I any other thynge then that? HERE. No that is plaine. CATH. Then am I the ſame that thou art, and thou the ſame that I am. But what ſo euer the ſame that I am, dooth, I dooe: And what ſo euer the ſame that thou art, doeth, thou doeſt. Therfore it muſte nedes folowe, that what ſo euer thou dooſte, I dooe, and what ſo euer I dooe, thou dooſte, beeauſe thou art the ſame that I am, and I the ſame that thou arte. HERE. Naie ſir, that will not folowe. CATH. Why ſo? HERE. Beeauſe you take this woorde (the ſame) other wiſe then I ment. For although we be eche the ſame that other is in nature, we doe yet differ in perſon: for ye bee one perſone, and I an other: And not the ſame that you be, nor you the ſame that I am. Therfore your actes bee not mine: nor mine yours. CATH. Yet thou thy ſelfe, when thou were firſt borne, were the ſame in nature, and the ſame in perſon then, that thou art nowe, and the ſame nowe that thou were then. HE: That I graunt. CATH. But thou were then, not one yarde longe. Therfore no more thou arte nowe, when thou art now the ſame that thou were then. HERE. What ſir yet againe? It is two thynges to be the ſame in nature and perſon: and to bee the ſame in quantitee. Therfore ye maie be ſure, that I ment not so nother. CATH. Then thou or I, were deceiued ageine in this woorde (the ſame). HERE. That is trew. CATH. Yet that quantitee of thyne excepte, thou wilte graunt thy ſelfe to be now, the ſame that thou were then.

HERE. Yea that excepte. CATH. And then thou coudest nother speake nor goe. wherof it folowethe, no more thou canst do nowe, while thou art nowe the same that thou were then. HERE. Tushe, sir after this maner, ye might reason also of myne age, and my knowlage, with all other powers and qualitees beside, when ye maie be sure, I dooe not so meane. CATH. Then tell me this, were not all englishe people an hundreth yeres passe, bounde to the lawe of this lande, and we nowe liuynge? also to the same. HERE. That is no doubte. CATH. Go to nowe, and take hede what I saie: we be bownd to the same law now, that thei were, whiche liued an hundreth yeres passe. But thei that were liuyng an hundreth yeres passe, were not bounde to the statutes and actes of the laste parliament. Therfore it folowethe, no more be we nowe: excepte thou wilt saie, thei be no partes of the lawe: and then we bee not bounde to them nother. HE. Sir we be bonnde to the law that our elders were, & thei to the same that we be. But this is vnderstande the same in generall, that is to saie, the lawe of Englande, without any respecte of partes. For it was none other, nor no lesse, then the law of Englande, whiche thei were bounde to: nor it is no other, nor no more then the lawe of Englande nother, whiche we are bounde to. Therfore when it is no more, nor lesse, nor yet none other, it muste nedes be the same (as I saide) in respecte of the whole generally, and not the same in respecte of the partes specially, by as many actes and statutes as hath bene sens, for considerations added vnto it mo then was than. Therfore your argument is falle, and can not holde.

Cap

Cap. 13.

CATH. Countrey man, I can thee thanke, for without queſtion thou ſpeakeſt herein very well: and therfore marke what I ſhall ſaie vnto thee, when it is ſo, that this woorde (the ſame) is of a ſignificacion ſo ambiguous & incertaine, that a thyng maie be ſaide the ſame in nature, and not the ſame in perſon, or the ſame in them both, and not the ſame in quantitee, or the ſame in al three, and not the ſame in power, or the ſame in one qualitee, and not the ſame in an other: or the ſame in generall, and not the ſame in ſpeciall: or the ſame in all theſe, & yet not the ſame in many caſes mo beſide: when a thyng (I ſaie) maie be called the ſame, and yet not the ſame, in ſo many reſpects, why did not Frith with al his ſophiſtrie (ageine the which he barked ſo ſore, & yet bled nothyng more) why did he not conſider all this in the woorde, and put awaie the doubtful vnderſtandyng, and ambiguite therof, before he made therupō his argumēt? Seing it might chaūce to be (as of him it is) taken otherwiſe, then the author of the worde, did meane or intende: for either he knew, or he knew not, that he ſhuld ſo dooe, or els take it for no ground or principle to diſpute vpon: if he did not know it, that is to ſai, if he did not know, that a concluſion can not be proued by any principle, whiche is incertaine: doubtles he was thē to blinde a teacher, to be beleued of any man, ſpecially in ſo great and weighty a mater as this is. For all men knowe, it is againſt both nature & reaſon, to come to ſuerte, by incertitude. Ageīn of the other parte, if he did know it, & yet wold (as he did) tumble forth his argumēt neuertheles: what other thing could moue him ſo to do, but only wilful malice & falſhed. For be it in caſe, that I perceiued a woorde or a ſentence,

the sence wherof: were doubtfull and incertaine (for the which no treuth therupon were probable) and yet before the ambiguitee therof were put awaie, wold grounde mine argument vpon the same: what could cause me so to do, but onely to make mē thinke, I proue that I proue not, And so make them beleue, that thei ought not. For the intent of euery erneſt argument, is alwai to cause the conclusion to be graunted, whether it be trew or fals.

Therfore what motiue therof canſt thou finde, in who so euer so doth, but euen a malicious intencion to deceiue other? Wherfore, whether blind ignorance, or els this wilful malice, were the cause why, that Frith did builde his argument vpon this slitting foundacion, I leaue it partly for this time, to thine owne iudgement. For of the one, or the other, I am sure thou canſt not excuse him

HE. Yes sir, he might chaunce (as many men do) purpoſly put foorth an argument, taken of an incerteine principle, to here what wold be said vnto it.

CATH. May nay my frende, that is not it, that cā excuse him. For although that, be somtime vsed in schooles, to the intent it might by that, be lerned, where the falsitee of such argumentes doth reſt: yet queſtionles Frith had here no such purpoſe. For he did not put it forth, to see what wold be said to the contrarie, or that it shuld be lerned, where the deceite of it laie. But his intent was onely by the craftines therof, to draw men into his falſe and wicked opinion. The which he held so vehemently to be trew, that he laied therupō, no les wager, thē his owne ſelfe, both body & soule: the loſſe of the which, without faile, is no les like in both, then it is wel knowen, to be sure in the one: how be it that shall paſſe, to come to our purpoſe againe, whiche is to shew, the great falshed of him in his argumente.

For

For who but he, wolde as who saie, so hedlyng at a venture iudge sainte Austen (when he saith, the same feithe shall saue vs, whiche saued the olde fathers) to mene the same feith in respect of euery particular point diſtinctly, and not the same onely in respect of the whole together confusely. For these two considerations dooe much differ in euery thyng. And that wonderous plainly in the law, as thou didst euen nowe declare thy selfe. For in the consideracion and respect of the whole, confusely to gether, it is euen the same now, that it was an hũdreth yeres past, & was euen thẽ the same that it is now: that is to say, the lawe of England now, and none other then: the lawe of Englande then, and none other nowe. whiche worde dooeth signifie, all the whole thinge to gether more or lesse without any difference or respecte of any speciall partes at all. For when thou heareſt it spoken, it dooeth put the no more in mynde of any one parte, then of any other. but of the vnitee of them all together, which, the name dooeth onely signifie. But the consideracion of the same in partes diſtinctly, dooeth differ farre from that. For in respect therof, it is not euen the same now, that it was an hundreth yeres paſte, nor the same then, that it is now, by all the actes and ſtatutes, which hath bene added vnto it since, and yet can it not followe but that it is the same lawe in general ſtil, for al the new partes, which it had not before. Also a tree, being full of new leaues, twigges, braunches, & bowes, is yet the same tree, that it was, yeres past before thei sprõge out of it: but how the same? the same in respect of the whole, which is but one. And not the same in respect of the partes which are many. For some partes be new, but so are not al. yet before the new partes were sprong out of

it, it was none other, nor yet no lesse then the same tree, that it is afterwarde: & afterward none other nor yet no more, then the same tree, that it was before. Therfore as the tree, full of new partes, is euen the same tree, that it was before: and yet not the same in euery pointe. And as the lawe of this lande, is euen the same law now, that it was an hundreth yeres paste, and yet not the same in euery point. Euen so is the feith of Christe now, the same that it was before his incarnacion, that is to sale, the feith of Christe then, and the feithe of Christe now, all one and the same, in respect of the whole (wherof it beareth the name, without respect of any nũbre of partes more or lesse) but yet not ỹ same in respect of euery point, without any maner of difference particularly. Wherfore suppose thou in it, but euen one particular difference, and tell me then, where is all Frithes argument become: when, for any thynge that is in it els, euen the feith of this blessed sacrament, might well be the same, which he laboureth so sore to ouerthrowe.

Cap. 10

HERE. An argument sir ye know right well, is not to bee auoided by suppositions or coniectures, but by probable and manifest reasons. And therfore if ye can proue any such particular difference betwene the olde fathers feith before Christes incarnacion and ours nowe, wherof it must nedes folow, ỹ saint Austens wordes can not be so vnderstande, as you sale Frith doth take them, I wot then what I haue to do. CA. Without faile there be diuers differences, not onely to sure to be doubted in, but also to manifeste & open to be inquired of. For had the olde fathers before Christes incarnacion beleued in euery particular pointe of the feithe as we doe: that is

to

to saie, beleued his blessed birth, passion, resurrection, and ascencion to be doone and passe, as we dooe: and we to come as thei did: Euen so farre differ we eche from other, that it had els ben damnable, bothe of their parte, and ours to. Also there was conteined in their feithe diuers sacramentes, whiche we haue not in ours. And lykewise in ours, whiche thei had not in theirs, and that the chiefe of eche parte. Ageyne, their feithe, beyng much hid, and couered with so many figures, darke shadowes, and misticall prophecies, as in maner the whole course of scripture dooth testifie that it was: who therfore wolde not see it to bee then, but obscure, grosse and confuse, in respecte of the pure distincte clerenesse, whiche ours tooke, by the very cõmynge of our sauiour Christe hym selfe, and the predicacion of his gospell? And what was that same obscuritee, but as who saie, a couerying of many poyntes together confusely, whiche the new bright splendour of Christe, did open and shewe distinctly? wherby it maie well appere, that their feithe and ours, coulde not bee throughly lyke and bothe one, in euery pointe particularly. More ouer there is no doubte, but that there were many good and faithfull folke, of the commune people of the Iewes, beside the prophets. Neuertheles, we maie not thinke, that thei had the feith in suche maner as the prophettes had them selfes (whiche were therwith immediately inspired of god) that is to saie, not so clerely, so specially, and so distinctly as thei had, but much more obscurely, grossly, & confusely: By reason wherof it is plain, that their feith conteined many thynges moe then thei were ware of them selfes, the which thinges were yet not so hid & vnknowne to the prophettes that taught them. Furthermore it is

not to be theught, that eche of the prophets had it lyke distinctly nother. When some of them be called more, and some lesse, as the cause wherof, doeth well apere by their woorkes, of the whiche, some one is farre more large then diuers of the resse together: God shewed not distinctly & apertly, all to eche of thē, but some to one, and some to an other. Yet we may not saie, ỳ he, or any of the cōmune people, which were feithfull, had for all that, any lesse then altogether cōfusely. For who so euer, at the least waie, hath it not so, doubtles hath rightlie therof, nothyng at all: because the trewthe of the whole feithe (as I shewed the yesser daie) is prively hid and conteined in euery parte of it. Finally, as the maner of hauynge the feithe, differd betwene the prophets and the common people of the Jewes then: so dooth it not onely betwene their tyme and ours, but also betwene some one sorte, and an other, of vs euen nowe. For there is no doubte, but the plowman hath now the same feithe, whiche hath the doctour of diuinitee, and the doctour, the same that he hath, that is to saie, the feithe of Christe: but yet farre vnlike. For where the plowman hath it in maner but grosly and confusely: the doctour hath it more specially and distinctly. And therfore in the plowmans confuse feith: doubtles there bee many mo speciall articles and misteries conteined, then he is ware of him selfe, whiche be not vnknowne to the doctour: Yet neuertheless, vnto the belefe, as well of them, as of the residewe, the plowman is no lesse bownde, (for all that he is not ware of them) then is the doctour of diuinitee with his prefise knowlage. For the same feithe shall saue the one, which saueth the other: Although thei haue it not bothe lyke, but with great difference. Therfore when the feith betwene

twene the fathers and vs, hath by reason of tyme, taken one difference, and that suche as thei could not haue bene saued, beleuyng in euery poynt as we doe, nor we beleuyng as thei did. And when it hath also taken an other difference in thynges, no lesse then very sacramentes, and that of the chiefe of bothe partes. And besyde all that, when there is betwene their feith and ours suche a difference in the maner of hauyng of it, that it maie bee saide, thei had the same and not the same that we haue: and we the same and not the same that thei had, because that, whiche thei had more grosly confusely, and obscurely, we haue it more particularly, distinctly and manifestly. Saint Austen (thou maiest well knowe) when he saieth, (as Frith dooth allege hym) the same feithe shall saue vs, whiche saued the fathers, neuer ment (as Frith dooth falsely vnderstande hym) the same feithe in euery condicion particularly, but the same, in respecte of the whole confusely, that is to saie, the feith of Christe generally, without any distincte consideracion of partes. As a man doth ofte tymes speake or thinke of money, without any consideracion of this coine or that, or how many diuers coynes bee conteined vnder the generall name of monete. As there hath bene sometyme fewer, and sometyme mo, and yet the generall name therof, no more, no lesse, nor none other, but alwaies one and the same.

Capitulo. 15.

HERE. Sir yet still, I dooe somewhat maruaile, how ye knowe, that Frith (as ye saie) dooth vnderstande sainte Austen to meane the same feithe in euery condicion particularly. CATH. And I doe meruaile also, how thou cowdest els fynde whithe waie saint Austens

Frens wordes might so muche as seme, any thynge to sounde to his purpose. For if he had vnderstande saint Austen to meane, the same feithe, with any difference, Then the same difference might haue bene in this holy sacrament, as well as in any thynge els. And where had Frithes purpose ben then? Therefore thou maiest easely perceiue, that he vnderstandeth hym to meane, without any difference at all. For if he had vnderstand so muche, and no more difference, betweene the fathers feithe and ours, but euen onely as is in the diuers maner of hauynge therof: that is to saie, of our parte, the particular, distinct, and pure clerenesse of it (whiche it tooke through the blessed comyng of Christe, and of their parte, the grosse and confuse obscuritee of it (wherin it was before that same light of the worlde came forthe & shewed his beames abrode) there were no doubte, but it wolde thereof well folowe (as the trewthe is in deede) that this holy sacrament, as well as the sacrament of baptisme, with many other thinges moe, was then in their feith, although not manifeste, as nowe in ours, but obumbrat, couered and hid, with the shadow of that clowdie season. Accordyng to the wordes of the apostle, saiyng: Our fathers were al vnder a clowde: which clowd had ben to thē no clowde at all, if euery particular parte of our feith, whiche was conteined in theirs, had ben so distinctly had and knowne of them, as it is of vs: yet thei had the same feith that we haue: how be it (as I saide) after an other maner. For if we should be bownde to the belefe of no mo thynges perticularly, then were open and manifeste to them before Christes most glorious incarnacion, because the same feithe shall saue vs, whiche saued them then: it must therof clerely folow, that either

1. Co. x

our

our saulour Christe him selfe brought with him no more light of the feithe, that is to saie, he reueled no mo secrets therof, necessarie for our saluation, then were open and knowne before. Or els if he did (by Frithes no reason) we are not bownde to beleue them: what wicked person wold beleue or thinke any of them both, beside Frith? I must nedes excepte hym, because it so foloweth of his owne doctrine. Therfore where the maner of scholes is this, that he whiche maketh an argument, must to confirme the same, proue the partes therof particularly by them selfes, whiche forme and maner Frith doth here sophistically pretend to imitate: And for ỳ proofe of his first parte, he hath no more but his allegaciō of saint Austen falsly vnderstande, which maketh for him euen therafter, as thou hast herde, I will now to the second parte of his argumēt, to see what proofe he maketh of that: except thou hast yet any thyng els to saie more in this. H E. Nothing for, that I wil yet declare, till I here what ye wil saie to the reste.

Cap. 16.

CATH. Then the second parte of his argumēt (thou knowest) is this, ỳ the fathers before Christs incarnacion, were not bound vnder pein of dānacion to beleue this point of the holy sacrament. Which parte (he saith) is so manifest, that it nedeth no probacion, and two causes why, he dooth allege, wherof the one is, that in their time it was neuer said. And the other is, ỳ it was neuer done. For without the woorde (he saith) thei coulde haue no feith. Therfore quickely to dispatche the one of them, if he will haue it folowe, that the fathers before Christes incarnacion were not bownde to beleue it, because it was neuer doone in their time: by the same reason it muste nedes folowe, that thei were not bownde

to beleue, the birthe of Chriſte, his death, his reſurrection, nor his aſcencion. For thoſe thynges were neuer done in their tyme nother. Wherfore if thei were not bounde to beleue thoſe articles, it muſte alſo nedes folowe therof, that we are not bounde to beleue them neither, becauſe the ſame feithe ſhall ſaue vs whiche ſaued them. HERE. Sir although theſe thynges were not doone in their time, yet thei were doone ſence. CATH. So was the holy ſacrament to. Therfore what is that to Frithes purpoſe? he ſpeaketh of their tyme, and not of any tyme ſence. For he goeth aboute to take awaie, our bonde of beleſe in the holy ſacrament, becauſe (as he ſaith) the fathers before Chriſtes incarnacion were not bounde to beleue it. And thei were not bownde to beleue it (he ſaith) becauſe it was neuer done in their time. And I ſaie, no more was Chriſtes birth, his paſſion, his reſurrection, nor his aſcencion nother. Wherfore (by his doctrine) the fathers were not bownde to beleue them. And by the ſame rule no more are we, becauſe the ſame feith ſhall ſaue vs, whiche ſaued them. Therfore is not this, that it was neuer doone in their tyme, one good cauſe why, that this ſeconde parte of his argument nedeth no probacion? as it nedeth not in deede. For without fayle it is plaine euil enough, without any probacion at all. And nowe therfore to his other cauſe, whiche is this, that it was neuer ſaide in their time: what muſte folowe therof? HERE. As Frithe dooth ſaie, that thei were not bownde to beleue it. For without the woorde (he ſaith) thei coulde haue no feithe. CATH. Then if he will haue it folow, that the fathers were not bownde to beleue it, becauſe it was neuer ſaide in their tyme, will it folowe therof, that we are not

bounde

bownde to beleue it, when we haue not onely herde it saide in our tyme, but also haue it in dede? HERE. Ye syr, for the same feithe shall saue vs whiche saued them. CATH. Then if we bee not bownde to beleue it, because the same feithe shall saue vs, whiche saued theim, and thei were not bownde to beleue it, because thei neuer herde of it: it muste also by the same reason folowe, that thei were not bownd to beleue any of those thynges, whiche our sauiour Christe, and all his disciples did preache and teache, more then was saide before their commynge in those fathers daies: so that in all the gospels and the epistles, that is to saie, in all the newe testament, there is nothyng saide, necessarie for our saluation, more then was saide, herde, and vnderstande, before the incarnacion of Christe in the fathers tyme: or els if there be: seeynge (after this doctours mynde) the fathers were neuer bownde to beleue it, because it was neuer saide in their tyme, and without the woorde (he saith) thei coulde haue no feithe, we nede not beleue it nother, because the same feithe shall saue vs whiche saued theim. is not this a goodly reason? Farder more, how dooth this doctrine agree with the woordes of our sauiour Christe him selfe, where, to his disciples he saith: Blessed are your eares, because thei dooe heare those thynges, whiche many prophettes and iuste men, greatly desyred to heare, and yet herde them not. Therfore what were those thynges, that made the eares of the apostles so happie and blessed in the hearyng of them, but the saiynges of Christe? And why were those prophettes and iuste men desyrous to here them, and herde them not: but because thei were neuer saide in their tyme? Therfore thei were not bownde to beleue them, and Mat. 13.

conſequently no moze are we nother, becauſe the ſame feithe ſhall ſaue vs, which ſaued them. Take good hede, foz this doctour will make thee a good chriſten man, if thou marke and herken well to him. Foz if our ſauiour Chriſte ſpake any thynges, of moze worthineſſe and pzo-fite then other, doubtles thoſe pzophettes and iuſte men, were moſte deſyzous to here them, and yet herde them not. But the cauſe why was this, that thei were neuer ſaide, in their time. Wherfoze thei were not bounde to beleue the moſte wozthie and pzofitable thynges, that e-uer Chriſte ſpake: and no moze are we nother, becauſe the ſame feithe ſhall ſaue vs whiche ſaued them. Alſo the chiefe thynges that euer Chriſte taught, are the chiefe thynges that apperteine to the helth of mans ſowle. But thoſe thynges were thei, that made the eares of his apoſ-cles bleſſed in their herynge of them. And thoſe thynges were thei, that many pzophets and iuſte men deſyzed to here, and herde them not. Wherfoze thoſe pzophets and iuſte men were not bownde to beleue, the chiefe thynges that euer Chriſte taught foz the helthe of mans ſowle: Becauſe thei were neuer ſaid in their time. And therfoze no moze are we bownde to beleue them nother, becauſe the ſame feith ſhall ſaue vs, whiche ſaued them.

Cap. 17.

HERE. Syz ye make (me thinke) moze adoe of the matter then nedeth: CA. Nate then tell me how much tyme ſhuld I ſpēde, if I ſhuld not refrain til I had ſhewed thee, all ſuche abhominable inconueniences, as muſte nedes folowe, of theſe firſte two partes, of his ſo-phiſticall argumente: Wherfoze, of the thirde parte, whiche is the concluſion, thou nedeſt not doubte what it is: And therfoze becauſe thou haſt ſufficiently herde, how

well

well he hath proued the partes therof: Beholde nowe the whole together, after the same forme and maner as he doth put it: And see how it will appere in an other article or two. ¶The same feithe (he saith) shall saue vs, whiche saued the olde fathers before Christes incarnacion. But thei were not bownde vnder peine of damnacion, to beleue, that the sacrament of baptisme is a sacrament. Therfore it shall folowe, that we are not bownde therto, vnder the peine of damnacion. The first parte of myne argument is proued, by saint Austen (after Frithes vnderstandyng) Addardanum. &c. The seconde parte is so manifeste, that it nedeth no probacion. For how coulde thei beleue that thyng, whiche was neuer saide nor doone: And without the woorde thei could haue no feithe. Upon the trewth of these two partes, muste the conclusion needes folow: whiche is this: That we are not bounde to beleue that the sacramente of baptisme is a sacrament. And euen by the same argument, that the blessed sacrament of ỹ aulter, is not so much as a sacramēt nother, as of his owne woordes I proued vnto thee before: so that, although we are (as euery man knoweth) bownde all, vnder peine of damnacion, to receiue the sacrament of baptism, yet we be not bounde to beleue it: that is to saie, we are not bounde to beleue the same thynge, whiche we are bounde to receiue, when the iuste rule is this, ỹ loke of what necessitee the thing is to be had, of the same necessitee, it is to be beleued. But thou maist see, what a feith this mans argument techeth vs, so new and strange, as I dare wel saie, neuer trew christē man was aqueinted withal, or the lyke. And yet let vs beholde, the patterne therof once againe in an other case: and so bliste vs cleane from it for euer. The same feith shall saue vs,

whiche

whiche saued the olde fathers before Christ incarnacion: But the Jewes dispersed now in Christendom (as in Roome, Venice, and in other places) haue the same feithe, whiche the olde fathers had before Christes incarnacion. Therfore it shall folowe, that the same feithe shall saue vs, whiche the Jewes hath nowe. The firste parte of myne argument, (after Frithes vnderstandynge) is proued by saint Austen ad dardanũ. &c. The seconde parte is so manifeste, that it nedeth no probacion: for the credence of so many, no light persons, but of sobre wittes and good lernyng bothe, as hath come from Roome, Venice, and other places (where many of the Jewes be nowe abidyng) and hath made reporte here amonge vs, not onely of their feith to be of the olde testament, whiche was the olde fathers feith, but also of their exceedyng diligence wherwith thei cesse not to kepe and obserue the same, and the ceremonies therof, so muche as thei maie, instructyng, teachyng, and bringynge vp their childzen in such maner therin, that thei be thought more prompte, readie, and perfecte in the letter of the olde testament, at .xvi. or .xviii. yeres of age, then the moste parte of our studentes be at thirtie. The credence (I saie) of those so many graue and sad persons commyng from where those Jewes bee, and reportyng these thynges of them, with muche and many other moe concernyng the same, dooth shew an argument ineuitable, that thei haue nowe the same feithe, whiche the olde fathers had before Christes incarnacion, specially when in their faste holdynge and keppynge therof, dooth consiste all their great hope, and whole truste of pleasynge god to their saluacion. Wherfore vpon the trewthe of these two partes, muste the conclusion nedes folowe. whiche

is euen this, that the same feith, which the Iewes hath now, shall saue vs: that is to say, without baptisme, without the beliefe that our sauiour Christ is come, or hath suffered death, or hath risen againe, or hath ascended to heauen, of the which, they beleue not so much as any one. Iudge now thy selfe, whether this bee of trew Logike, or of deceiueable Sophistrie: yea rather of very trew feith, or abhominable heresie: Is it not a proper argument, which can so trie our dewtie in euery article, from one to an other, that without parill of damnation we maie leue our beliefe of them altogether? For surely, and without any doubt, loke how much it maketh ageinst this article, which he wold ouerthrow, if he might: Euen so much it maketh not onely ageinst many moe directly, but also against them altogether consequently. If it make nothing against all (as I saide before) without faile no more doth it against this one: For any thing against this one, and so much against all: Nothing against all, and as litle against this.

Cap. 18.

HERE. Well sir, we haue enough of this. And therfore I pray you, let vs here what he bringeth more of saint Austen in other places. CATH. Some reason thou semest to require. But yet I wolde first wit of thee, where he had these wordes of saint Austen, which he hath herein thus alleged alredy, and boasteth so much to make for his purpose? HERE. He him selfe dooth tell you where, in that he saith ad dardanum, that is to say, in that epistle, which saint austen wrote to one Dardanus. CATH. Ye but when frith dooth allege saint Austen in other places, he dooth allege him in his owne wordes as he wrote them at the first in latine,

and after dooeth translate the same in to Englishe. And therfore why dooth he not here now, euen so likewise? HERE. He doth allege him in Englishe. CATH. And why not also first in latine? HERE. What nede that here, when thenglishe is enough? CATH. Why nedeth it not here, as well as in other places, where he dooeth both? HERE. It nedeth not in any place, when thenglesshe is as good, and dooeth serue the turne as well as the latine. Wherfore there is no matter in this. For it was but as it chaunsed him to dooe. CATH. Chaunsed him? Nay my frende thou shalt not excuse hym so. For I will recite vnto the, saint Austens owne wordes of the same place my selfe, both in latine and also in Englishe. And then tell me how this Reynards allegacion therof, dooth agree withall. For the very wordes of saint Austen speking there, of the sacrament of babtisme, are in latine euen these.

» Sacramẽtũ porro regenerationis nostre, manifestum
» esse voluit manifestatus mediator: Erat autẽ antiquis
» iustis aliquid occultum. Cum tamen & illi eadem
» fide salui fierint, quæ fuerat suo tempore reuelanda.

That is to saie, certeinly, the mediator made manifest, wolde the sacrament of our regeneracion to be manifest. For there was something hidde from the old iust men: when for all that, they were saued by the same feith which was to bee reueled, when the tyme therof came. Now marke how Frithes allegacion agreeth with this. For he maketh it in these wordes: The same feith (he saieth) shall saue vs, which saued the olde fathers before Christes incarnacion: how dooeth this and the other, sound and agree? dooeth saint Austen make here any mencion of Christes incarnacion? any mencion of fa-

thers

thers? any mencion of vs? as this wilie pie dooth chat-
ter and clatter vnto vs? HERE. Sir although he doth
it not directly in proper wordes, yet is it so implied in his
saiyng, that it maie well bee gathered therof. For by
those olde iust men, he ment the olde fathers. And by the
same feith, he ment the feith that saueth vs sence Christes
incarnacion. So that all this (I saie) maie well be ga-
thered of his saiyng. And according to the same, Frithe
dooeth here allege him: CATH. Although thou saiest
in Frithes behalfe, as much as can be said for him, yet
thou must nedes graunt, that the same, that Frith doth
here allege, is not the very wordes of saint Austen, but
Frithes owne gathering therof, as he him selfe doth take
them. HERE. What of that? CATH. I shall tell the
what, thou hast herde enough to perceiue, that his ga-
thering is not of saint austens meaning. wherfore it can
not be auoided, but he doth here allege saint Austen in
that, which saint Austen neuer said, nor ment, when he
doth allege him nother in his wordes, as he spake them,
nor yet in the sence, that he ment them, but vnder pretece
therof, in his owne proper meaning, according to his
false dreamyng and nothing els. HERE. May sir and
ye go so to worke, I must nedes looke better vpon the
matter. For where ye saie he doth not allege saint Au-
stens wordes, that is not so. For although he dooth not
allege them all, yet he dooth allege some of them.
CATH. Thou saiest well therin. For indede some of
a mans wordes, maie so be handled without the rest,
that they are enough to inuert and ouerthrow the very
right sence of al the whole tale. And therfore what words
of saint Austens be those that he dooth here allege? HERE.
That are these: thei wer saued (saith S. Aust.) by the same

feith and the same feith (saith Frith) shal saue vs. CA. Callest thou this an allegation of a mans wordes, which shuld alway bee, but a full rehersall or a recitall therof, to witnesse, proue, or confirme an other thinge by? For to that purpose, all trew men doue euermore vse it, and none otherwise. But here thou seest no rehersall at all, but onely an other distinct saying: and so distinct, that it differeth in wordes, it differeth in order, it differeth in sence, it differeth in tyme, it differeth in person, and almost in euery condicion: so that it may well be denied to be any of saint Austens minde. In so much, that if Frith had leste out, put in, or chaunged, but a worde of saincte Austens saiyng, he had yet made therin, but a false allegation. Wherfore now, sith he changeth in maner no lesse then all together, what shall we saie, but that, vnder the onely colour and pretence of an allegation, he dooeth falsly belie saint Austen, and nothing els? HERE. Sir that soundeth but shrewdly, and therfore I pray you say not so. CATH. Why may not I saie so, as well as he dooeth so? For dooeth he not herein lacher and forge the great proofe of his purpose vpon saint Austen? And yet what one word hath he here of saint Austens saiyng but onely this, that he saieth, the same feith? whiche he taketh neither in the same sence, nor order neither, that saint Austen speaketh it in. And therfore dooeth he not lie vpon him, when he saith his purpose maie be proued by him? for what can a worde or wordes proue, when they make no perfit sentence? and what perfit sentence maketh these words, They were saued by the same feith? But wottest thou why, he handleth the matter after this sort? HERE. Why say you? CATH. I shall tell the. Frith toke this place of S. Austen, as though it had bene

like vnto a snaake: whose venim (men saie) is but in the head and the tayle: whiche beyng cutte away, the reste of the bodie maie well be eaten, as it is said, to be vsed in some countreis. And therfore according to the same, Frith perceiuing the head and taile of this place of saint Austen to be suche, as were enough and able to kyll and destroy the whole pith of his purpose altogether, did in his allegacion cutte them both cleane away: and yet he suspectinge that they wold, at the least, bee missed and asked for, if he shuld haue brought forth all the rest of his bodie, as it is, did also therfore cutte out therof, but this preatie peece (the same feyth) so litle, as wherby it shulde not bee knowen, of what kinde of bodie it was: And so, neither the head, nor the taile be looked for, nor missed nother. For if he had brought forth the whole rest of the bodie together, that is to say, the middle part as it is, and said thus as saint Austen doth (they were saued by the same feith) we muste nedes haue required the head of that bodie, and asked of him, which they: For thou maist well perceiue, that saint Austen wold not haue said, they, (which hath relacion to some other worde) except he had put somewhat before, vnto the which he dooth referre it. And that was nothinge els, but (as it apereth in his owne plaine wordes) the old iust men, from whom (he saith) there was some thinge hidde. Ageyne likewise, we must haue required also the taile of that bodie to, and haue asked of him, whiche same feith is that: for this worde, the same, muste nedes bee referred to somewhat, before or after, or els it can haue no sence: And there is nothing before, that it can be referred vnto. wherfore it is declared by that, which commeth after, and that is the

same keith, which (as saint Austen saith) was to be reue-
led, when the time therof came. Now for al that this is
the principal place of saint Austen, wherin Frith hath his
great and most singular trust, for the special defence and
chefe prose of his foundacion, yet if there be any sparke
of good will and wit in the at all, thou maiest clerely per-
ceiue and see, not only how nothing it maketh for him,
but also how cleane it maketh directly ageinst him, and
ouerthrowth his purpose quite: ye and farder, how in-
uincibly it doth declare and proue that to be trew, which
I haue said vnto the all redy concerninge the same.
For doubtlesse this is the place (as he saith him selfe)
wherof he doth (after his facion) gather and saie,

» The same keith shall saue vs, which saued the old fathers
» before Christes incarnacion.

Where as saint Austen saith, (if thou marke him well)
that they were saued, by the same keith, wherin was some
thing hidde from them. And againe, by the same keith,
which was to bee reueled, when the time therof came:
whiche was not in their daies: but (as he saieth) when
the mediator was made manifeste, and wolde the sa-
crament of our regeneracion to be manifest: And that
was not before Christes incarnacion. Wherfore thou
maiest now euen here perceiue, by the plaine wordes of
saint Austen him selfe, directly against Friches purpose
how the old fathers keith and ours, dooth both differ, and
not differ, not differ in respect of the whole, considered in
generall: And yet much differre, in respect of the parte
considered in speciall. For by the plaine wordes of saint
Austen, there was some thinge hidde from them, that is
not hidde from vs: And some thing reueled to vs, that
was not reueled to them. And yet one and the same keith

in respect of the whole confusely together: and not one, nor the same nother, in respect of the partes considered a sonder. Wherfore, of that which was hidde from them, and now reueled vnto vs, why may not this holy sacrament, with the beliefe therof be a part, as well as the sacrament of baptisme is: if there be no reason nor treuth to the contrary, as there is not in dede, where is Frithes foundacion become? Therfore shall I nede now to aske the any more, why Frith doth not here allege saint Austens owne wordes, first in latine, and then in English, as he doth in other places, but leaueth them both cleane out as he doth? I thinke thou seest the cause why well enough now thy selfe: If not, how saiest thou to such a felow as bringeth in a witnesse, and when the witnesse should speake, he will not suffre him to tell his tale? HE. I saie he semeth not al the best. CATH. May, if he seme not to the, a very false harlot, yet will I saie plaine, that he is no lesse, when he trusteth more in the name of his witnesse, then in his tale. HER. As ye saie, there is somewhat in that. CATH. Then farder, how saiest thou to that felow, which in his cause, wolde pike out such a witnesse for him, as when he commeth to the hering, wolde and must nedes tell the tale cleane against him? HERE. Mary sir, I say, he were a very foole to chose his witnesse so. CATH. Yet may his witnesse be wise for all that. And therfore when the one of thes felowes plaieth (as thou saiest) the false harlot, and the other the very foole, is it not here properly hādled of Frith alone, to play no lesse, thē both those partes in one? And to haue S. Austen his witnesse in each of them to? HERE. How so? CA: First it apereth plaine, that S. Austen for his witnesse he bringeth in, and leueth his tale behinde

him cleane, because he wold not haue that come to hering in no condicion: For els, he might haue brought them, both together, euen as well the one as the other. But that he wold in no wise doue, because he knew the name of his witnesse, might in his cause seme to doue somewhat, where as his very tale withall, could in dede doue nothing, but mar altogether. And therfore to brag out the matter, forth he commeth with his bare witnesse whom he kepeth cleane in silence, as vntruftie to talke in his cause, while he telleth of his owne head, all the whole tale, and maketh vp the euidence him selfe. Wherfore because he faceth vs after this forte, saiyng,

> The firste parte of mine argumente is proued by sainte Austen ad Dardanum. And I dare boldly saie almoste in an hundreth places. For I thinke there bee no proposicion, whiche he dooeth more often inculcate then this, that the same feith sauеth vs, whiche saued our fathers.

I say, because he faceth vs after this forte, with such a worthy credible witnesse, and yet, when all commeth to all, wolde not suffre vs, (by his will) to here him speake, nor him, as who saie, to tell his owne tale, nother in this named, nor yet in any other of those hundreth incertaine places beside, what shall we, or can we make of hym els, but euen as he maketh of him selfe, a very false harlot in deede? And therfore as towchinge the other parte of his plaie; what a foole was he, to chose saint Austen among all other, to bee his witnesse herein? when there was none more vnmete for his purpose then he, as belike he did suspect, and yet wold haue him neuertheles, for his foolishe phāsie: trusting that with the sound of his name to do somewhat: where as with his whole saiyng

he coulde doe nothynge: But yet notwithstande all his great shifte made, to kepe hym from herynge, (wherin he sheweth hym selfe as he is) yet was he brought by meane vnto it at laste, and then tolde his tale so directly, against the peruers purpose of Frithes wicked folie, that nothyng could be saide moze plaine to the contrarie, as thou hast nowe herde thy selfe alredie. Wherfoze consider, that thou haste here nowe, foz one pece of thy frendz falshed, suche a manifeste proofe, as I dare saie nother thou, noz any frende that he hath beside, is able to caste any colour of excuse therupon: excepte it be, with tushe tushe, no no, oz some other wriglynge and startlynge talke, from one thynge to an other, till vndiscussed the matter be wrapte vp euen all confusely together, as your common practise is alwaie to dooe: Therfoze let this be sufficient, as it is in dede, to knowe what he is.

Cap. 19.

HERE. Naie sir not so. Foz he wolde not call it the very foundacion of all his matter, if he had not somewhat els, to make foz hym then all this.
CA. I praie thee what is that? HE. No lesse then an other saiynge of saint Austen, whiche maketh as well foz hym as any thyng that ye herde yet. CA. I thinke thou saidest not a trewer woorde to daie. HE. Naie sir, I wot what you meane by that wel enough: but I meane this, that it maketh foz him very wel. CA. Who wold beleue that, knowyng so much as thou hast herde? HE. That is no matter saint Austens woordes (he saith) be these.
As many as in that māna, did vnderstande Christe, did eate the same spirituall meate that we dooe. But as many as sought onely to fill and satisfie their hunger with that māna, did eate and are deade. And likewise the same drinke. Foz the stone was Christe.

CATH. What I praie thee, will Frith make of this?

HERE. Mary sir ye shall here his owne woordes.

» Here you maie gather (he saith) of saint Austen, that the
» mãna was vnto them, as the breade is vnto vs. And like-
» wise that the water was to them, as the wyne is to vs:
» whiche anone shall appere more plainly.

CA. So it had nede. For he sendeth vs here to a gatherynge, wherin I see not what we can gather more trewly, then euen the same of him, that we haue gathered before. HERE. No sir, for he dooth alege, that saint Austen saith furder these woordes:

» Moyses also did eate manna, Aron, and Phinees did eate
» of it: and many other did there eate of it, whiche pleased
» god, and are not deade. Why so? Because thei vnder-
» stode the visible meate spiritually. Thei were spiritually
» an hungered, thei tasted it spiritually, that thei might
» spiritually be replenished: thei did all eate the same spiri-
» tuall meate, and all did drinke the same spiritual drinke,
» Euen the same spirituall meate, albe it an other bodely
» meate. For thei did eate manna: and we eate an other
» thynge: but thei did eate the same spirituall, whiche we
» dooe. And thei all dranke the same spiritual drinke. Thei
» dranke one thynge, and we an other, but that was in the
» outwarde apparence: whiche for all that did signifie the
» same thing spiritually, how dranke thei the same drinke?
» Thei (saith the apostle) dranke of the spirituall stone folo-
» wyng them, and that stone was Christe.

Now sir al this doth he allege of saint Austen. CA. Yea, but doest thou recite it trewly, as he doth allege it? HE. Euen as he doth translate it out of latine into englishe, looke in his booke when ye will. And therfore what saie ye to it? CA. This same I sai to it, that al this same difficultee of this same point, after this same maner, is put this same waie, clene out of doubte, if men take this same trewth, as it is in dede, ỳ this same errour, of this same felow, made hym of this same blindnesse, that he was of

the

this same iugemēt, that this same woꝛde, the same: could none otherwise be vnderstande, but euen the same waie, that he thought the same shuld dꝛaw men, from the same feith, which al trew chꝛisten people doth holde, & bꝛinge them into the same heresie, whiche the same Frith hym selfe doth teache. And all this same (I saie) did he, by reason of this same woꝛde the same. Foꝛ is he not as one in a maze, now in the same path, where he began? And therfoꝛe euen iuste in the same case, that he was than? Foꝛ is there any other cause, why he doth allege these woꝛdes of saint Austen, but that he saith thei did eate and dꝛinke the same spiritual meate & dꝛynke, that we dooe? Foꝛ what if saint Austen had put this woꝛde: an other: in the place of this woꝛde the same? oꝛ els had left them both cleane out? HE. Sir that had ben an other matter: it had bene then, nothyng foꝛ Frithes purpose. And therfoꝛe he wolde not alleged it, if it had ben so. CA. Thou saiste very trew. And therfoꝛe all that semeth herein, any thyng to make foꝛ him, thou mayest well perceiue, doth only reste (as I saide) in this same woꝛde, the same. And haste thou not herde enough, what a pꝛoper pꝛinciple it is, beyng vndefined, to pꝛoue oꝛ conclude any thyng by? Neuertheless, whē Frith him selfe doth take this same spiritual meate and dꝛynke, to be the bodie & bloode of Chꝛiste, as in the xiii. leafe of his booke, his owne woꝛdes therof are these, This Abꝛaham (he saith) did both eate his bodie and dꝛynke his bloode, thꝛough feith.

I wolde therfoꝛe wit of hym, whether he take the same meate, & dꝛinke, to be only spiritual & not coꝛpoꝛal: oꝛ els both spiritual & also coꝛpoꝛal? HE. He doth take it to be both, & so do I. CA. As how? HE. Euen as he doth here allege of. S. Aust. ỹ thei did eate māna, and we an other thig? which thing? are both coꝛpoꝛal, wherin, that same,

which thei did, and we dooe eate, is one spirituall meate: And therfore that, whiche thei did, and we dooe eate, is both spirituall and corporall. CATH. Thou plaiest frith with me now in dede. For my question is one, and thou answerest me to an other. I aske not of their corporall meate, nor of ours nother, whiche to them was, and to vs is, subiecte to the eie, and other outwarde sences: but I aske onely of the spirituall meate, whiche was to them and is to vs (as saint Austen saith) all one and the same. Therfore whether that be onely spirituall, and not corporall, or els bothe corporall and spirituall, is my question. HERE. What if he saie it bee onely corporall, and not spirituall? CATH. Then is he directly againste saint Paule in his firste epistle, and xb. chapiter to the corinthians. HERE. What if he saie it be onely spirituall, and not corporall? CATH. Then he is directly against the veritee of Christes bodie. And therfore I wolde wit what he wolde saie to my question? HERE. He wolde saie, it was spirituall in the olde fathers daies before thincarnacion: And now corporall. CATH. What, onely spirituall then, and onely corporall nowe? HERE. Naie, onely spiritual then,
1.Co.15 and both spirituall and corporall nowe? CATH. Then he can not denie, but that same meate, is both so, and otherwise nowe, then it was then, when it was then but onely spirituall, and now both spirituall and corporall. HERE. That I graunte. CATH. Therfore sith it is both so, and also otherwise nowe, than it was then: why shulde it not be so, and otherwise eaten now, than it was eaten then? For it was not then, the same it is nowe, really in dede. And yet is it nowe, the same it was then, virtually in effecte. Wherfore there muste

bee

be a corespondence betwene the very present state of the meate, and the very eatyng therof euen nowe, as there was then. And therfore when saint Austen (after the minde of the apostle) speaketh here only of that eatyng, whiche is accordynge to the meate, as it was then virtually in effecte, and not of that eatynge, whiche is accordynge to the meate, as it is nowe really in dede: what maketh he for Frithes purpose? HERE. It maketh for hym this: That as thei did eate the same spirituall meate, whiche we dooe nowe, and were saued by the belefe and feithe therof, as well as we are: so, Frith wolde haue it folow, that we are not bounde to beleue any other maner of eatyng of the same meate, beside the outwarde apparence, than thei were then, because the same feithe (he saith) saueth vs, whiche saued them. CATH. As touchynge the same feithe, thou hast herde enough alredie, of his foolishe and false vnderstandynge therof. And therfore to the reste. Trewe thou saiest, that he wolde haue it so folowe in dede, but by what rule? by what congreuence? by what reason? is there any rule or reason other, to leade vs to this consequence, that because thei did eate the same spirituall meate that we dooe, we shulde not therfore bee bownde to the belefe of any other vsage, maner, or difference of eatynge that holy meate now, then thei were then, before Christes incarnacion, when the blessed meate in it selfe, is farre otherwise nowe, than it was then? and when we haue also nowe, an other maner of doctrine taught vs, of Christe him selfe, concernyng the same, than euer thei had then? how farre were this against reason? HERE. Yet was it the same meate then, that it is nowe. And therfore the same nowe, that it was then. CATH. Trewe it is.

And yet saie I, it was not then, as it is nowe, nor is not now, as it was then. HERE. How can that be? CA. Very well. For as I tolde thee before, it was then onely spirituall and not corporall, but so it is not now. For now it is both spirituall and corporall, and so was it not then: wherfore as it maie bee saide, and was then, the same and not the same, that it is now: So it may be saide and is now, the same and not the same, that it was then: whiche is to bee vnderstande in the diuersitee of the respectes, that is to saie, of the spiritualitee, and the corporalitee. wherof saint Austen touchyng here but the one, Frith with the same, wolde deceiue vs in bothe. For els he wold or shulde haue made it first certaine, whether saint Austen did here meane the same spirituall meate, really in dede, or els the same but virtually in effecte, before he had attempted any conclusion therupon. And therfore because he doth now here againe, leue the certaintee of the meanyng of this same woorde, the same, so doubtfull and indefined, as he did before, (the whole pith of his purpose consistyng therin) clere it is, that nothyng therof can iustly folowe, nor be certainly proued therby, as thou thy selfe hast sufficiently seene and herde alredy. How be it, the certaintee of a grownde, to reason vpon, is no matter with Frith.

For he will first conclude, what so euer he doth intende,
And with an incertaine principle so make vp the ende,
As though euen where in very dede, doth lie no lesse then all
There were euen vtterly to be founde no matter at all.
And while there be fewe, of whom this falshed is perceiued,
Small wonder it is, though many be therwith deceiued.
He asketh no more of al his diligent readers,
But that thei shoulde be well ware of all those same sophisters:

whiche

Which will make thē perceiue him, one of those same warrears,
That are of all other, the chiefe spirituall murderars.
Beware of sophistrie, and sophisters, beware crieth he:
Yet any one man that vseth it more, didst thou neuer see.
And therfore eueu now of hym, what a sophister finde we,
But one of the very worste, that is possible to be?

Cap. 20.

HERE. What sir, me thinke your talke rēeth now in rime: CA. That is no matter, so longe as it renneth not against reason. HE. Whether it doe or no, yet it pleaseth not my phantasie. CA. Why so. HERE. What nedeth any ryme, when reason maie well be without it? CA. Canst thou not tell what nede? HE. No not yet. CA. Then thou meruellst at me, why I doe put them to gether. HE. And euen so I do in dede. CATH. Therfore why dooest thou not muche more marueil at Frith, whiche refuseth to meddell with any of them both? In so muche that rime, thou knowest he vsed none: And as for reason, how farre it is from him, maie well apere by his manifest falshed an lacke of trewth: Wherfore excepte thou wilt saie, that reason maie bee in falshed, and where trewth is absent: thou shalt surely finde in him, as it is somtime saide of an other, that all his talke renneth cleane without rime or reason. And therfore where as I might haue, somwhat els to saie, as touchyng ỹ maner of his allegacion of saint Austen, in these two later places, yet because he hath no reason to lay to the contrary but ỹ thei make no lesse thē far frō his purpose, I wil passe thē ouer with ỹ I haue said alredie, & go to that, which he bringeth in of. S. Beda: whose few words in latine are these.

Videte autem fide manente signa variata. »

This turned into english: is none other to sai, but beholde

Cap. 21.

HERE. Sir that shall ye dooe. For consequently in the same. v. leafe of his boke, these be his wordes.

" Of those places (he saieth) you may plainly perceiue, not
" onely that it is none article necessarie to be beleued vn-
" der peine of damnacion, seyng the olde fathers neuer
" beleued it, and yet did eate Christ in feith, both before thei
" had the māna, and more expressly through the manna: And
" with no lesse fruite after the manna was ceased. And albe
" it the manna was to them as the sacrament is to vs, and
" they eate enen the same spirituall meate that we
" dooe yet were they neuer so madde, as to beleue,
" that the manna was chaunged into Christes owne
" natural bodie: but vnderstode it spiritually, that
" as the outward man did eate the material manna, which
" comforted the bodie: so did the inwarde man through
" feith eate the bodie of Christ, beleuynge that as
" manna came downe from heauen and comforted
" their bodies: so shulde their sauiour Christ, which was
" promised them of god the father, come downe from hea-
" uen, and strength their soules in euerlasting life, rede-
" mynge them from their synne by his death and resur-
" rection. And likewise dooe we eate Christe in feith,
" both before we come to the sacrament, and more expressly
" through the sacrament. And with no lesse fruite after
" we haue receiued the sacramente, and neede no more
" to make it his naturall body, then the manna was,
" but might muche better vnderstande it spiritually:
" that as the outwarde man dooeth eate the natural
" breade, whiche comforteth the bodie: so dooeth the
" inwarde man through feithe eate the bodie of Christ, bele-
" ning, that as the bread is broken, so was Christes bodie
" broken on the crosse for our synnes, whiche comforteth
" our soules vnto life euerlastinge. And as that feith
" did saue them, without beleueing that manna was
" altered into his body: euen so dooeth this feith saue
" vs: although we beleue not, that the substance of
" breadde is turned into his naturall bodie. For the

same

same keith shall saue vs whiche saued them. And we are bound to beleue no more vnder peine of damnacion, then they were bounde to beleue.

Now sir this is part of his minde. C A. Thou saiest euen trewth. And therfore if thou marke it well (somewhat after his owne wordes: thou maiest of this place plainly perceiue, not onely by the presence of this worde, not onely, but also by the absence of this worde, but also, that he at the first, intended to shewe vs two thinges. The one of the whiche, noted with this worde not onely, he hath here (as thou seest) declared all redy, But the other depending therupon, and ought to be noted with this worde, but also, he dooth vtterly passe ouer and let it cleane goe. For he renneth so wonderous fast, and can not tell whither, that he forgetteth the one ende of his tale, while he telleth vs the other: or els he doth purposely reserue and kepe it in store, till he speake with vs hym selfe, to shew vs that and more. HERE: Tushe sir ye doe but mocke him now. C A T H. Why countreiman what woldest thou haue me do? For to pitee him, thou knowest wel, it is to late: To praise him there is in dede no cause: To holde my peace in this matter were to farre against conscience. And what remayneth, but alwaie to speake as he dooeth minister occasion? Therfore where he saieth, that the old fathers were neuer so madde, as to beleue that the manna was changed into Christes owne naturall body: for what purpose doth he tel vs that, when euery man knoweth it as wel as he? C A. I shal tel you for what purpose: he wold haue vs take the bread as the fathers tooke the manna. And as they were neuer so madde, as to belene that the manna was changed in to Christes owne naturall bodie: so he wold

not haue vs so madde, as to beleue, that the substance of bread is changed into Christes naturall body nother. For the same feith (he saith) shal saue vs which saued thē.

Cap. 22.

CATH. Thou saiest well, for that is his purpose in dede. And therfore as touching his principle of the same feith, I haue told the enough before. And as concerning this changeing he speaketh of, thou and I will talke therof at large, when we come to the place conuenient. Therfore now to this that he doth here accompte all those, which beleue, that the substance of the bread, by the operacion of the holy ghost, in the holy consecracion is changed into the very body of Christ, to be mad in so doing, who be thei? but al Englishmen, Welshmen, Irishmē, Frenchmen, Scottes, Danes, Douchmen, Spaniardes, Portingales, Italiās, with al other trew Christen nacions? for doubtles al those dooe so beleue.

HERE. May sir not all. For all can not be said, of Englishmen only: nor yet of diuers other perticular nacions beside. For some among them beleue otherwise. CA. And pretely spoken. For is it said amisse, that such and such feldes are all corne, because they are not eache of them without some and to much darnell in and amonge them? what if there be founde such to many, as Frith was, among Englishmen? and other trew Christen nacions beside? doth that let the trewth of this, that all those nacions beleue otherwise then he did: that is to say, that the very substance of the breade (through the operacion of the holy ghoste, in the holy consecracion) is turned into the very blessed body of Christ? al those multitudes, Frith (thou seest) doth recken therin to be madde. He dooeth not except al, or any, trew christen princes:

about

about whom there lacketh not men, in wit, grauitee, and lernyng, of the beste sorte that maie be had: which seme not of al men to be lightly deceiued: wherof in this matter specially, thei are vtterly most lothe. Therfore dooth the sadnes of Frithe, shewe vs madnesse in all christen princes, in all their prudent and wise councellours: and in all their multitudes of peoples innumerable vnder them? or els doth not the sadnesse of all those, shewe vs the wonderfull madnesse of hym? I require no answere of this, but consider it well with thy selfe. And therfore what is there more in all his woordes, whiche thou hast here rehersed, but onely his owne swasions: and foolish continuall daunsing about this same woorde the same? wherwith thou seest he wolde conclude & confirme what so euer he babled before. Neuertheless, yet forthe he goeth, shewing vs in the fyrst lefe of his booke after his fantasie, how the olde fathers did beleue, saiyng:

There is no poynte in our Creede, but thei beleued it, as well as we dooe: and those articles onely, are necessarie vnto saluacion. »

Who hath herde suche an other teacher? For of this, it must nedes folowe, that it is not necessary vnto saluacion, to beleue that Christe is equall with the father. For whiche of the .xii. articles is that? Those .xii. onely (he saith) are necessary vnto saluacion. And this, that Christe is equall with the father, is none of the .xii. Wherfore the belefe therof is not necessarie vnto saluacion. Also it is not necessarie vnto saluacion, to beleue it a damnable thynge, to peruerte and depraue the harde saiynges of saint Paule and other scriptures (although saint Peter doth saie the contrarie) because it is none of those .xii. articles, whiche he saith are onely 2. Pet.

necessarie vnto saluacion. And to bee shorte, we maie denie by his doctrine all the whole scripture, those .xii. articles of our Crede excepted, if thei onely (as he saith) be necessarie vnto saluacion. For what so euer is not necessarie to saluaciō, maie be vnbeleued without any danger of damnacion. This doth he somwhat more plainly declare immediately hym selfe saiynge these woordes:

> But the other pointes conteined in scripture, although
> thei be vndoubted veritees, yet maie I be saued without
> them.

What is, this same, saued without them, but saued without the beleke of them? That is to saie, although thei be neuer so trewe, and that of moste worthie thynges. Yet I nede not beleue them. Therfore when he noteth, all Christen princes, and all Christen people, to bee madde, for their beleke, whiche thei haue in the blessed sacrament: how muche maie we note him, more then madde, that will beleue and so saie, that he maie be saued without the beleke of all or any veritees conteined in scripture, beside those same .xii. expressed in the Crede? HERE. Sir I suppose that Frithe wolde soone auoide all these absurdites, whiche ye dooe gather to folowe of his woordes: and saie that the veritee of Christes equalitee with the father, and suche other veritees, as ye speake of, are priuelie conteined in the .xii. articles of our Crede, & beleued in them, although thei do not therin, expressely and distinctly apere. CATH. Naie naie countreie man, neuer suppose, that he wolde saie so. For then wolde I quickely aunswere hym and saie, as the trewthe is in dede, that the veritee of this holie sacrament, which he denieth, is one of them, and that it was conteined and hidde in the olde fathers feith, as many

other

other veritees were confusely, to be reueled and brought to light distinctly, when their time therof should come, which was by the comyng of our sauiour Christe. Therfore with this, Frithes mowthe were soone stopte, if he wolde saie so. But he was ware of this well enoughe: And prouided for it therafter, that men shoulde not take hym so to meane. For els when he saith those articles onely, are necessarie to saluacion, he wolde not haue added this vnto it, saiyng:

The other pointes conteined in scripture, although thei be vndoubted veritees, yet maie I bee saued without them.

Therfore who hath hearde of suche a doctour, that will not denie, but all the pointes of scripture, are vndoubted veritees: And yet will holde, that we are not bownde to the beleke of any moe of them but onely twelue? I coulde neuer here of any veritee of the scripture (as there be in it none other) but who so euer wolde not beleue it, he was vtterly therin no lesse then an heritike: But this man is, and so teacheth other to be, at libertee with them all, onely twelue excepte. HERE. It maie so bee, well enough, in certaine cases. CATH. What cases, I praie thee be thei? HERE. He dooth forthwith declare. ii. or. iii. him selfe. CATH. Then let me here them. HERE. Thei be euen these.

As be it in case (he saith) that I neuer herde of them.

There is one.

Or when I here of them, I can not vnderstande them, nor comprehende them.

There is an other

Or that I here them, and vndestande them, and yet by reason of an other texte misconstrew them.

There is the thirde.

CATH. A, bee these the cases, wherin men be not bounde to beleue any veritees of scripture mo then those xii. expressed in the Crede? HERE. So saith he. CATH. Then saie I, that if thou marke it well in his firste and seconde case ioigned together, he dooeth put, whether he dooe heare them, or not here them. And in the seconde, and thirde case, whether he vnderstande them or not vnderstande them: So that he dooth not put these cases, but onely to thintente that in euery case, he might auoide and cleane exclude, the nede of all the veritees of scripture, saue onely twelue. For when he saieth he maie be saued without them, whether he here them or here them not: and whether he vnderstande them, or vnderstande them not. And therfore after his owne doctrine, whether he beleue them, or beleue them not? what nede maketh he of any of them all, but meneth awaie with them clene in euery condition. For if he maie be saued without them (as he saith he maie) then it is clere, that he hath no nede of them. If he haue no nede of them: doubtles he hath no nede to beleue them. Therfore if he haue no nede to beleue them: in very dede, he hath lesse nede to vnderstande them (for more necessarie is beleefe, then is vnderstandynge in thynges of our feith) and therfore if he nede not beleue them, nor vnderstande them, plaine it is, that he nedeth not so much as here the (for what shuld he here, that he nedeth not beleue) Therfore if he nede not so muche as here them, he hath vtterly no nede of them at all: if he haue no nede of them at all: then be thei (as he wolde make them in dede) no partes of the feithe at all: excepte he will saie (as he dooth so muche as it cometh to) that all the moste parte of the feith nede not to be herde: And consequently, nor beleued no-

ther.

ther. Thus are we clerely dischargedsk all the veritees of scripture, saue onely twelue in euery condicion wherok he might be asked this prety question, why thei were writen? But how so euer this diuelishe doctrine behaueth it selfe: what other thing is the feithe of Christ, but all the veritees of scripture? And contrary wise, what other thyng are all the veritees of scripture, but the feith of Christe? Therfore when all the veritees of scripture, are conteined in the feith of Christe (as it is one of them so to beleue) And the feith of Christe (as I shewed thee yesterdaie) can not bee trewly had, but all whole together: It muste nedes folowe, that who so euer hath trewly the feith of Christe, hath also therin no lesse then all the veritees of scripture. Fals therfore is the doctrine of Frith, that saieth, we maie be saued without them all, saue only twelue: when the feith can not be trewly had, without them all. More ouer, how saiest thou to this: is it not a necessarie veritee vnto saluacion, to beleue that the commaundementes of god are good, and ought to be kepte? HERE. Sir what question is that: there is no man dodeth doubte therin. CATH. And is there any perell in it, if a man dooe not so beleue it? HERE. In very dede no lesse then damnable. CATH. Take hede, perchaunce thou wotest nere what thou saiest. HERE. Why what? CATH. Vtterly that Frith is a fals lier: when he saith, those articles of our Crede, are onely necessarie vnto saluacion. For which is it of those. xii. to beleue, that the commaundementes of god be good, and ought to be obserued and kepte, or that there is any perill in it: if we do not so beleue? Those. xii. onely be necessarie, saith he. This veritee thou seest is none of them (although as all other, it maie bee reduced vnto them)

whiche he will none of in any case, leſt that, whiche he laboureth to ouerthrowe, ſhoulde ſo by that meanes, bee brought in likewiſe: after his minde therfore without this, we maie be ſaued. That is to wit, without the beleſe, that the commaundements of god be good, or ought to be obſerued & kepte: who will not ſee, that this were enough, to declare what a teacher he is? or who hath ſo dull a wit, that he can not perceiue how diueliſh his purpoſe is? and it were but only by this, that he can finde no waie to come to it, but only by ſuch damnable pathes as this is? Beholde how faine he wold proue it no nede, ſo to beleue in the bleſſed ſacrament of the alter, as all trew Chriſten people beleueth: In very dede ſo faine, that, to bring it to paſſe with al, he ſticketh not here (as thou ſeeſt thy ſelfe) to leue vs clene without the nede of any, and of all the veritees of holy ſcripture, mo then bare. xii. for in thoſe. xii. veritees of our Crede, he thought ſurely, that this veritee of the bleſſed ſacrament could not be founde. And therfore he dooth ſaie: that thei onely are neceſſarie vnto ſaluacion, to thintent he might vtterly therby exclude the nede of this, whiche he wolde ſo cleane put awaie, that euen for that cauſe, he excludeth no leſſe, then all the reſte, ſaiynge:

> The other pointes conteined in ſcripture, although thei be vndoubted veritees: yet maie I bee ſaued without them.

And this he declareth in euery condicion, that is to ſaie, whether he beleue them or not: whether he vnderſtande them or not, and whether he miſconſtrew them or not: All theſe I ſaie (ſaith he) maie be doone without any ieoperdie of damnacion.

Cap.

Cap. 23.

HERE. Ye but sir, ye must take his conclusion with all. CATH. What is that? HERE. Marie this: Therfore we beleue (he saith) these articles of our Crede: in the other is no perill, so that we haue a probable reason to dissent from them.

CATH. Doubtles a conclusion euen like hym selfe. How be it I muse not so muche therat, nor yet at hym nother, as I dooe euen at thee. HERE. At me, why so? CATH. Without faile, because thou dooest no more wonder at his blynde madnesse, or madde blyndenesse, choose thee whether. How bee it I dooe partely consider the cause. For surely if thou thy selfe were not by hym, somewhat combred with the same clowde of darkenesse, wherin he was involued and wrapped hym selfe, thou shouldest easely, beside his wily wickednesse, perceiue hym tumbled into the greattest foolishnesse that euer thou sawest any man. For whē he saith, in the other is no perill, so that we haue a probable reason to dissent from thē, make not I sai: O foliſh Frith, what if we haue none, nor none can haue? how then? how is it possible to haue any probable reson to dissent frō any veritees most special & aboue al, frō any veritees of holy scripture? For what reason is there probable in dede, but onely that, whiche is trewe in dede? and can any one trewth be against an other? Therfore if thou marke this matter well, thou shalt finde, that by these wordes, he setteth vs euen at as muche libertee, with our feith in all the .xii. veritees of our Crede, as he doth in all the other. For in them is no perill nother, so that we haue a probable reason to dissent from them. HERE. Why sir, we make not dissent from them in no wise. CATH. What not

with a probable reason? what thynge is there, that a probable reason dooth not bynde me to dooe? For what is a probable reason, but that, whiche maie iustly be proued to be treiwe. And shall not treiwth leade me treiwly to and fro in euery condition? HERE. Pe but there can be no suche probable reason, to leade as from those veritees of our Crede. CATH. Why not from them, as well as from the other veritees of scripture beside? bee thei moze treiwe, then any of the other are? How be it, thow speakest this of thine own head. For Frith saith no moze, but that we maie dissent from all the veritees of scripture, saue. xii. so that we haue a probable reason therto. And I saie the same, by that reason, of those xii. also, if we haue a probable reason therto: For what ought I to refraine, whiche a probable reason will leade me vnto? am I not alwaie bownde vnto treiwth? and what other thing is a probable reason? Therfoze it must nedes folow by his reason, that in these veritees of our Crede, is no perill, so that we haue a probable reason, to dissent from them. Thus taketh he from vs, the nede of all the veritees of scripture, saue. xii. so that by the same reason he taketh awaie the nede of them to. And therfoze he semeth to except them in woozdes, but not in dede. HERE. Pes sir, foz els he wold not saie this.

> Those articles are onely necessarie vnto saluacion. For
> them am I bound to beleue, and am damned without
> excuse, if I beleue them not.

CATH. What of this? thou thinkest by reason of these woozdes, that he goth about to make vs beleue, that we be bounde to the veritees of our Creede. HERE. what els? For what purpose shoulde he speake it, but foz that? oz to shew vs, how he doth beleue them him selfe. CA.

I thought euen as much, when he intendeth none of them both. For his purpose is not to make vs beleue them, but onely to make vs to beleue no moe. For, to go about to make vs beleue so much, is one thinge, and to go about to make vs beleue no more, is an other thing. Therfore his intent is (as who saie) there to stoppe in our feith, that it shulde goe no farther, and not to bringe it thether, nor there to vpholde it. For although his blindnesse be so great and manifest, that euen the very same, which he laboureth to improue and ouerthrow, he confesseth to be a veritee of scripture (or els wolde he neuer cal it an article of our feith, as in the. xvi. lese of his booke he dooth in deede) saiyng these wordes.

For though it be an article of our feith, yet it is not an article of our Creede, in the. xii. articles, whiche are sufficient for our saluacion.

Although his blindnesse (I say) be so great, that he himselfe dooeth confesse this a veritee of scripture, which he laboreth so sore to improue: yet because he thought it coulde not be found among the. xii. veritees of our Crede euen therfore wolde the catchpoule, as it were in a pinfolde, pyn vp therin our feith, from all the veritees of scripture besyde,: and all to thintent it shulde not come at this veritee of the holy sacrament, and that for the speciall hatred he beareth vnto it. Howe bee it in so saiyng I confesse my selfe somewhat to large. For why shoulde I saie, that he beareth a speciall hatred against this blessed veritee, when he serueth them all a lyke? yet am I therin somewhat to rashe to. For why shoulde I saie, that he serueth them al a lyke, when he wold slee al those for this, and not this for them, but this for it selfe. not muche vnlyke vnto hym, whiche for the malice he bare against one innocent, slew an whole multitude. Mych. 2.

But as that Herode milled his purpose of that one, whō he principally intented, and (to his owne perdition) was but a meane of bringing al the residew to a farre more clerer light then they had before. Euen so I doubt not of this Herode likewise, but that he shall misse his purpose of this one veritee, which to destroy he doth chefly intend. And also in the multitude of other beside (although to his own perditiō) be but a meane of bringing thē to a more clere light of knowlage in many one thē euer they had before. That Herode & this, although persecutors both, and both of Christ, wherin they gree. Yet in the maner of their persecution, somwhat they differ. For that Herode did persecute him directly, and apertly: but this Herode, consequentlye & occultly, vnder & with the pretence, of the cōtrary. That Herode, sent men to find him where he was not, but this Herod sedeth men to lese him where he is. Also that Herod laboured to make him be takē, but this Herode, laboured to make him forsakē. He with manifest cursednesse: & this with false feigned holinesse, He with cruel tyrannie: & this with wicked heresie. Therfore what so euer this yong Herode doth saie, as towching the veritees of our Crede, neuer thinke, that he speaketh it to make vs beleue it, nor yet to shew, that he beleueth it him selfe. For that he saieth, is onely to make vs beleue no more, for lesse he thought he coulde not. And therfore he supposing, that if he might stoppe our feith therin, from goyng any farther, he might then bring his wicked purpose to passe well enough. And to be suer therof, he wolde by suche a rule, discharge vs of our feith in all the veritees of scripture, saue onely these. xii. of our Crede, as wolde leade vs euen likewise, from the feith of them to: when he saieth,

In

In the other is no perill, so that we haue a probable reason to dissent from them.

This probable reason (as I haue tolde thee) is able to discharge vs of all maner of thinges none except, wherin so euer it maie be had. And therfore as well of all the veritees of our Crede, as of any other veritees of scripture beside.

Cap 24.

HERE. Sir, I do now perceiue, that al this while, ye take one probable reason for an other, and not that probable reason, which Frith speaketh of. CATH. Hah, what saist thou? I pray the tel me that agein. HE. Mary sir I say, the probable reason that Frith speaketh of, is not the same, that ye take it for. CATH. Trowest thou so? HERE. No trewly. CA. What is it then HE. Ye know well enough, that there be two maner of probable reasons: of the which, the one hath in it a trewth ineuitable. And therfore it is or maie be called a probable reason existent. The other hath in it no trewth in dede, yet is it so like to be trew, that it is very hard to auoid, or to be otherwise perceiued or taked but for trew in dede. And therfore it is, or maie bee called a probable reason, apparent: but not existent. CATH. I ran thee thanke countreyman, it is euen very well saide. And therfore doest thou thinke, that it is this probable reason, which is but aparent, that Frith speaketh of? HERE. Yea trewly that I dooe. CATH. Why so? HERE. For it can not stande with any reason, that it should be the other probable reason, whiche is trew, because (as I now perceiue my selfe) one trewth can neuer leade vs to dissent from an other, but rather binde vs vnto it. CATH. Doubtles therin thou hittest the

nayle

naple euen vpon the head. And therfore by that ſuſt and good reaſon, it dooeth well apere, that when frith (ſpeaking of tharticles of our Creede) doth ſaie.

» In the other is no perill, ſo we haue a prohable reaſon to » diſſent from them.

It is not that prohable reaſon, which hath in it the very trewthe in deede. But it is that prohable reaſon, which is but only apparent, and doth but onely ſeeme to be trew & nothing els. therfore what ſo euer doth but only ſeme to be trew, without fayle is not trew in dede. And what ſo euer is not trew in dede, and yet ſemeth to be trew, is vtterly nothing els, but euen a meane to deceiue. And therfore the very concluſion is this, That wher he ſaith, » In the other veritees of ſcripture is no perill, ſo we haue » a prohable reaſon to diſſent from them.

It is no more to ſay, but in the other veritees of ſcripture is no perill, ſo we haue a deceitfull meane to diſſent from them, when a prohable reaſon without trewth is none other, but (as I ſaid) a meane to deceiue in dede.

HERE. May ſir I can not yet for all this, beleue that he ment ſo. CATH. No? not when his owne word compelleth vs to take it ſo? For he can not ſpeake of a prohable reaſon, and meane it to bee nother trew nor falſe: except thou wilt faie (as of many a one it is, when he ſpeaketh he wotteh nere what) that his wit is not his owne. Therfore he mēt it to be either trew or falſe. If he ment it to be trew: then is it as much to ſaie, as in the other veritees of ſcripture is no perill, ſo we haue ſuche a prohable reaſon to diſſent from them, as is not poſſible to be had. For it is not poſſible to haue trewth, againſt trewth. Wherfore how fooliſhe at the leaſte is he, to ſuggeſt vnto vs, any ſuch caſe? Therfore of the other ſide, if he ment a prohable reaſon but aparent, and not

treiwe

trew in dede: Then is it no moze to saie but this, In the other veritees of scripture is no perill, so we haue that pzobable reason to dissent from them, which is so redie and easie to be had, that al we ought, to bisse vs from it.
HERE. Bisse vs from it, what nede that? CATH. Nedeth it not, to bisse vs from that pzobable reason, which might leade vs to dissent from ani veritee of scripture? Foz what is the scripture but godz wozde? therfoze what is any verite of scripture, but the verite of godes wozd? And what pzobable reasō is that, which ledeth one to dissent frō any veritee of godz wozd, but only ỹ falsitee of ỹ diuels wozde? Yet herein, saith Frith, there is no peril. This thou seest, he moueth vs vnto. Foz with a pzobable reasō (he saith) we may without any peril, dissent frō all the veritees of scripture, saue. xii. and I saie, by that rule, from them to. Therfoze, while Frith doth here in plaine wozdes, shew vs a way, to dissent from the veritees of holy scripture, whiche is the wozde of god, what other thing therin doth he els, but vtterly shew vs the waie of the diuell? How be it herein, he teacheth vs but a poynt of his owne facultee. Foz by this pzobable reason, founde he the meanes, to dissent and come awaie from the veritees of holy scripture him selfe. Foz els, without fayle, he had bid in them still. By this pzobable reason also, riseth the first heretike of euery secte. And by this pzobable reason, deceiueth he an other. By this pzobable reason gender they mo and mo. By this pzobable reason grow they, sometyme to a multitude. And by this pzobable reason they continew, to the disquietnesse of the faithfull flocke of Chzist. Also by this pzobable reason which is but apparent, which semeth iuste, and is not, which pzomiseth trewth, and paieth not,

which beareth in hand to dooe, that it can not. By this probable reason (I say) heretikes are enticed, perswaded, and led, from the veritees of scripture, from the veritees of godz woorde, and from the veritees of euerlasting life. And by this probable reason, they are prouoked and set a woorke, to crie to the people, and say beware of deceiuers, beware of false teachers, beware of subtill Sophisters. And what other thing therin do they els, but ignorãtly and euen directly against their owne purpose, moue the audience to be ware of them, & of no men els? For such and the same are thei, & in dede none other. Therfore let vs now returne to his third case againe, briefly to see what we left therin behind (he saith)

» Or be it in case, that I here them, and vnderstand them
» and yet by the reaso of an other text misconstrew them

Here he driueth me to such a streit, that I can not tel whether I maie more wonder at him, or at his case. For tell me, if euer thou herdst of any such braine. How is it possible for any man to misconstrew the same, which he doth vnderstand? Is it one thing to vnderstand, and an other to know? Is any man therfore able to take a thing otherwise, then he knoweth it is? Doth not the knowlage or vnderstanding of a thinge, cleane put away the misconstruing therof? For wherof, commeth misconstruing, but of misunderstanding? neuertheless,

» Be it in case (he saith) that I vnderstande them, and yet
» by the reason of an other text misconstrew them.

Here thou seest plaine, that he putteth vnderstanding, and misconstruing, both together in one respect, and one case, and that by the reason (he saieth) of an other text. Therfore whether he meaneth the veritee of that other text, to be vnderstanded, or not vnderstanded, let vs trie what followeth of each of them, and the we shal be

sure

ſure, to come to his meaning, at the leaſt in one of them. Therfore if he meane it vnderſtanded, then this muſt folowe, that the vnderſtanding of the veritee of that ſame one other text, maie put away the vnderſtanding of all the veritees of ſcripture. xii. except: when it may, bring the vnderſtander to the miſconſtruction of them, as by his words it may, when of them al (he ſaith)

Or be it in caſe that I here them, and vnderſtand them, ,
and yet by the reaſon of an other text miſconſtrew them. ,

So that the trew vnderſtanding of that ſame other text, is but a meane, to make the veritees of all the reſt to be miſconſtrued, and that of him that vnderſtandeth them. And what is that to ſay but this, that the trewe vnderſtanding of one text, maie bringe a man from the trewe vnderſtanding of of an other, when it bringeth him to the miſconſtrewyng therof? And therfore doeſt thou not ſee, what good reaſon and trewth, he teacheth in this caſe? haſt thou heard of this ſame leſſon before that the trew vnderſtanding of one text, ſhuld plucke away the trew vnderſtanding of an other, from him that hath it? I haue herde that the trew vnderſtanding of one text, might induce and bring to light, the trew vnderſtanding of an other: But I neuer herd a fore now, that the trew vnderſtanding of one, might miſconſtrew, & ſo put away, the trew vnderſtãding of an other, when trewth (as I tolde the before) is a meane to come by trewth, & not a meane to miſconſtrew & put awai trewth. for ſo, were trewth againſt trewth, and vnderſtanding againſt vnderſtanding: And therfore Frith doth here to ſaue al vpright, make miſcõſtruction, which is the great enemy of them both, to be as a ſtickeler betwene them: wherfore of the other ſide, if he meane ỹ the verite of this

other text which may make this misconstruction, is not vnderstanded, then must this folow, that the ignorance, and not vnderstanding of the trewth of one text, may put away the knowlage and vnderstanding of the trewth of an other text, as it must nedes dooe, if it maie make it misconstrued, as Frith dooeth hold it maie. And so shall blinde ignorance be more mighty and able to expell and put away clere and perfite knowlage, from him that hath it, then perfite knowlage is able to expell and put away it: as though the ignorance of one thing, were the driuer away of the knowlage of an other, whiche is an ouerthwart rule, contrary to all reason and trewth. For it is the naturall propertee and strengthe of knowlage, where so euer it commeth, to subdew and expell ignorance, and not of ignorance, to ouerthrow and expell knowlage. How be it I will not say. but ignorance maie and commonly doth in many cases, kepe trewth from knowlage and vnderstandinge: but yet when and wherin so euer knowlage and vnderstanding doth once get the victorie, and obteineth it in dede, ignorance then goeth streight to wrake, and is vtterly put to flight, for any thing therin it can dooe more. Wherfore, the trewth of one text, vnderstanded or not vnderstanded, can neuer driue the trewth of an other, out of vnderstanding, as it might doe, if it might driue it to misconstruction, as it can not, because there shulde be then (as I said) trewth against trewth, and vnderstanding against vnderstãding, which can not be. Therfore whether the trewth of this other text, ỳ Frith speaketh of, be vnderstãd or not vnderstãd, yet false is this his saiyng therof, that it may cause the trew vnderstanding of an other text or veritee of scripture, to be misconstrued of him

that

that hath it, and so put awaie: when it is not possible for the trew vnderstandynge of a thynge, and the misconstruynge of the same, to stande to gether, excepte Frith wyll saie, that he can ioigne them together this waie, as when he vnderstandeth a veritee neuer so wel, yet he can purposely misconstrewe the same neuertheless, to beguilde and deceiue his neighbour withall, and beare him in hande, it is otherwise ment, then he hym selfe, dooeth knowe it is. HERE. What sir, ye dooe but taunte hym nowe.

Cap. 25.

CATH. Tawnte or tawnte not, thou shalt neuer fynde, how he can otherwise ioigne them together when thou hasse all doone. And therfore, as a man so trowbled and tyred with this case of his owne, that he woteth nere whiche waie to turne hym, he geueth it ouer quite, and falleth to an other matter, euen with these woordes:

But nowe to returne (he saith) to our purpose, if we will
eramine the authoritees of saint Austen, & Beda before
alleged, we shall espie, that beside the probacion of this
foresaide proposicion: thei open the misterie of all our
matter, to them that haue eien to see:
(Those he meaneth, whiche are as blynde as he.)
For saint Austen saith (saith he) that we and the olde fa-
thers dooe differ, as touchynge the bodily meate. For
thei eate manna, and we breadde.
Now countreiman, because thou didst after his allegacion recite the woordes of saint Austen vnto me thy selfe. I praie thee hertily therfore remembre them well, and tell me trewly, whether saint Austen spake there, so muche as any woorde of bread, as this felow dooth nowe reporte hym. HERE. Sir therin to confesse the trewth,

saint Austen saith, that the fathers did eate manna, and we an other thynge. But in dede he hath not there this same wourde bread. CATH. Thou maiest see therfore what a iuste parte gentle Frieth plaith herein with saint Austen. He thought this wourde bread, wolde sownde somewhat more for his purpose, then this wourde an other thyng: whiche in dede soundeth towarde it nothyng at all. And therfore in the stede therof, in with breade he cometh, but not by and by immediatly after he reherseth the wourdes of saint Austen: but longe after. For had he brought it in streight waie, while the wourdes of saint Austen were in the minde of the reader: he wist wel enough, it wolde then be soone perceiued and taken, not like a pointe of falshed, but euen as it is, for very one and the selfe same in dede. and therfore he falleth first in to a longe bablyng of his owne phantastical inuention. And afterwarde, when he supposeth the wourdes of saint Austen somewhat growne out of remembraunce with the reader:

Then, in cometh the baker with his mustie bread,
And that he dooth only, euen of his owne head
without cause or requeste, made of any man,
But onely in liyng, to shew what he can.
wherfore in fewe woordes, by my very assent,
He shall for his great labour, be this content:
what so euer other men saie, or will thinke,
To take his bread with hym, and goe ere he drinke.

HERE. What sir me thinke ye fall to rymyng againe.

CATH. In very dede, if thou were, so able to weigh and consider how wylie and foolishe his falshed is, as some men are and doth in dede, I doubte not, but thou woldest saie thy selfe, that rimynge onely, were good e-

nough

nough for hym, although it were (as it is not here) without bothe reason and trewthe. For he that vseth, (where alwaie two of them ought to be) nothyng els but falshed in dede, Is not euen the least of them three, more then enough, and to good for hym? How false dooth he apere once againe, in this reporte that he maketh here nowe of saint Austen? For coulde not saint Austen hym selfe haue put in this woorde bread: as well as this woorde, an other thynge? if he had so ment, or had not seene some good cause to the contrarie? was his minde so occupied in treatynge only of this matter, that he had forgotten the proper name of bread, whiche was moste present redie and apte to be thought vpon in this case? or coulde he not call that woorde to remembrance: because it was so strange and farre out of vse? He sticketh not at manna, but directly expresseth it with the proper name therof: why staieth he at this woorde bread, more then at that? was it more strange and farder out of vse, then the manna was? why dooeth he touche this, with no proper name: but with a woorde commune, and indifferent, in maner to all thynges? wolde he refraine so redy a thynge, and see no cause why? if he sawe any, what was that? Frith will not put that in question vnto vs: he wolde not here of it: he had leuer haue vs forget it: it maketh not for his purpose, as hereafter it shal well apere. HERE. Yet sir in some other places, seint Austen hym selfe dooth call it bread plainly. CA. Why therfore, dooth Frith allege him so here, where he dooth not so cal it: & will not allege hym there, where he doth call it so? what meneth he by that? doth it signifie nothyng? I wil wel, that saint Austen so doth call it: & that diuers times: but yet neuer without suche a certaine conuenient

circumſtance with all, as declareth what he meaneth by it: whiche circumſtance, Frith perceiueth to make no leſſe agaynſt hym, then this woorde breade, ſemeth to ſownde with hym. And therfore becauſe the woorde and that circumſtance, he can not fynde in ſaint Auſten aſonder, he therfore hym ſelfe, wolde plante the one, in ſome other corner alone: as thou ſeeſt hym here, this craftily aſſaie, where he dooeth knowe, that circumſtance to bee awaie: And therfore this haſt thou herde a great parte of the very thynge I maie ſaie vnto thee, whiche (as he ſaith) dooeth open the miſterie of all his matter, to them that haue eien to ſee: Although he meaneth but thoſe (as I tolde thee before) whiche are as blinde as he: wherfore, haſt thou not nowe, euen more then enough, to perceiue what a goodly foundacion of his this is, to builde any good woorke vpon?

Cap. 26.

HERE. To ſaie the trewthe, if it be no better then ye make it, he hath not leide it ſo depely as I thought he had done: CATH. Maie ſaie not ſo, for he hath leide it no leſſe depe, I maie ſaie to thee, then euen downe to the diuell hym ſelfe: And therfore fynde thou no lacke in the depeneſſe therof: for deper could no man laie it in deede, then he hath done: And yet not withſtandynge that, and all that I haue declared therof beſide: Beholde how he glorieth therin, and what a face he ſetteth vpon it, as though there were no ſuche matter at all: for in his preface and firſte leſe of his booke, where he ſpeaketh of his firſt treatiſe, whiche he wrote in huckermucker, and not (as he confeſſeth hym ſelfe) to be publiſhed abroade, he hath theſe woordes:

But nowe it is commune (he ſaith) abroade in many mens

mens mowthes, in so muche that maister Mooze whiche
of late hath busied him selfe, to meddle in al such matters
(of what zeale I will not diuine) hath soze laboured to con-
fute it, but some men thinke that he is ashamed of his
parte.

And a little after, he addeth vnto it these woordes.

But this I am right sure of, that he neuer towched the
foundacion that my treatise was builded vpon. And ther-
foze sith my foundacion standeth so sure, and inuinsible
(foz els I thinke verely he wolde soze haue laboured to
haue vndermined it) I will therupon, buiide a little
moze: and also declare that his ordinance is to slender to
breake it downe although it were set vpon a woze foun-
dacion.

Whiche I late is not possible to be had: and yet foz all
that in the thirde lefe. his woordes therof be these:

This was (he saith) the foundacion of my firste trea-
tise, that he hath lefte vnshaken: whiche is a great
argument that it is very trew. Foz els his pzegnant wit
coulde not haue passed it so clene ouer. But wolde haue
assailed it with some sophisticall cauellacion whiche by
his painted poetree, he might so haue coloured: that at
the leste he might make the ignozant some apparence of
trewthe, as he hath done against the residew of my firste
treatise, whiche neuertheles is trew, & shall so be pzoued.

Now it pzoueth, thou hast had a good laie therof alredie:
And yet beholde (as I saide) how he glozieth therin, as
though it were in very perfection, moste suer and inuin-
sible: in so muche, that with those termes he bosteth and
setteth it out (as here thou seest) to the vttermoste: when
it is in dede no lesse, but euen as farre behinde, as he
wolde set it fozwarde. And as foz that he saith here,
of maister Mooze, euery man knoweth of his notable
wozthinesse, what a singular man he was, both of witte
and learninge, and yet marke how lewdly this felowe
dooth here vse hym with nothynge els, but very mockes

tauntes, and checkes, thinkyng therby to deface him, and set out hym selfe: but whiche waie that turneth, I suppose it no nede to tell thee: Therfore I praie thee tell me, how cometh this to passe: that one hauyng not halfe the witte or lernyng, that Frith was thought to haue, before he fell to these foolish, fonde, wicked, and erroneous opinions: can soone perceiue so muche folly and falshed in his booke, that there is in maner no lefe without it, and yet he hym selfe, coulde see therof nothynge at all: how (I saie) cometh this to passe: Maie we not thinke, that he met with that faculte, whiche causeth it to bee trewly saide of some man, that the lenger he liueth, the more foole he weareth: That is to saie the more he taketh of it, the les witte he hath: for if he sawe any falshed therin, then went he wittyngly aboute to deceiue men: if he sawe none, wherin is so muche: what bitter smooke so troubled his eies, that he coulde not espie some parte therof: was he not taken (troweste thou) into the westwarde tuicion, of that darke and inuisible tutour, whiche (for all thy saing) caused hym therin to wander, he wist nere whether: howe maie we thinke otherwise, if we with diligence prepende well the matter: for the very trewthe to saie (as I tolde thee before, and nowe also againe, to thintent thou shuldest the better bere it awaie, and kepe it in mynde) if the diuell hym selfe, were at the libertee, to be incarnate: And euen so to come amonge vs, onely to entice and lede vs from the beleefe of any article of our feithe, let me see, how it were possible, for that father and fountaine of all craftie falshed, to inuente for that purpose any maner of deceiueable wyle, comparable to this, whiche we fynde in Frith: That is to wit, to beare vs in hande, that it is indifferent, and at

our

our owne libertee, to beleue it or not: there is no perill in the matter, take whiche parte we luſte: for, by this perſwaſion, how many treiwe men is there in a lande, towched with neuer ſo litell a nede, that might not ſoone, be brought to ſtealyng, if thei were borne in hande, & ſo perſwaded to thinke in dede, that it were an acte indifferent and without al maner of perill to them that wolde vſe it? Be what maner of euils are thei, whiche ſome men (now full honeſte) wolde then forbeare and refraine, if thei thought, were therin to them no daunger? or whiche waie might thei ſo eaſely be led vnto them, as to be ſtifly ſo borne in hande: ye make them but once beleue that, and lede them no farder: for it ſhal then be no nede at al. a meruailous zeale of iuſtice hath he, that wolde not ſone plaie the thiefe at a companions requeſte, if he were once brought in opinion, that therin could be, to him no maner of peril. Thus learned Frith (of whom ſo euer he was taught) to perceiue, that he had a wonderous faſt feith in this bleſſed ſacrament, whiche wolde not ſone be content to leue it, if he were once brought in opinion, that therin could come vnto him no maner of diſpleaſure. he ſaw it a matter of moſt difficulte, to make Chriſten people leue any part of their feith directy: but he ſaw it agein, a matter as eaſy, if thei might once be made beleue to be no peril therin, if thei ſo did: full well he wiſt, bring them once to that opinion, and let them then alone them ſelfes. For it ſhulde be enough, with the helpe of his owne doctour of darkeneſſe, whiche taught hym this leſſon: for doubtles from whence it came, the thyng it ſelfe, doth ſhew and declare: wherfore of this his moſte perillous, crafty & wicked willines in this cace, let this, with ỳ I ſaid therof before, be a ſufficient occaſion for the, wel to prepẽde, marke,

and conſider, bothe what it is, and wherof it came: For the more thou thinke vpon it, the more thou ſhalt ſee in it: And the more thou ſhalt ſee in it, The more (I dare well ſaie) thou ſhalt miſlyke it: ye and at lengthe, euen abhorre it: HE. Ye dooe what ye can, to make a man abhorre it in deede: CATH. If I dooe otherwiſe, I ſhoulde not dooe well: And therfore take thou good hede vnto it, for it ſtandeth thee ſo in hande: HERE. Whether it dooe or not, I wyll not forget what ye ſaie.

Cap. 27.

CATH. Then of the other ſide, to growe to an ende for this tyme, what ſhall I ſaie, more then I haue done, of his moſte fonde, fooliſhe, and blinde falſhed: whiche apereth ſo plaine, in euery thynge, that he medleth withall, that I can not well tell, what to ſaie more, but that I am ſure thou neuer ſaweſt nor herdeſt of the lyke, nor no man els. For who but he, in a matter of our feithe, wolde graunt vs a libertee to beleue that, whiche he hym ſelfe, doothe not onely, not beleue, but alſo ſtiffly holde and ſaie, that it is falſe, and no ſuche thynge in deede: And yet for all that, ſaie, that it is an article of our feithe to. HERE. What ſir, ye ouercharge hym nowe to farre: for there is no man ſo madde, (I thinke) as to ſpeake thynges, after ſuche a ſorte: CATH. If thou haddeſt excepted hym, I wolde graunte the ſame. HERE. Naie I wyll not excepte hym, nor no man els herein. HERE. Then againſte hym, let vs take none other, but euen he hym ſelfe to witneſſe. For in the laſte lefe of his booke, where he calleth the changeyng of the ſubſtance of breade & wyne into the very fleſh & blood of our ſauiour Chriſte,

at the time of the holy consecration therof, the opinion of the prelates, as though it were but their opinion, and nothing els, his owne wordes be these.

The cause why I can not (he sayeth) beleue their opinion of transmutation, is this, first because I thinke verily that it is false, and can not bee proued by scripture nor faithful doctours, if they be well pondered.

Here thou seest plain of his own wordes, that he taketh this article to be vtterly false. And yet he geueth vs libertee and leue to beleue it nedertheles: as it may and doth well apere, by this, that he (saying, neither parte ought to dispise other) willing more reprehende vs therin, then he wolde that we shuld reprehende hym in the contrary. For each (he saith) seketh the glory of god: And therfore by that (as I towld the before) the one in a trew faith & the other in a false, for both can not be trew. Wherfore beside this, the very same, which he doth here sai in plaine word, that he thinketh verely to bee false, he confesseth it as plaine, to be an article of our faith, saiyng, Though it be an article of our faith, it is none of our Creede.

Therfore by this it is clere, that although he deniseth it an article of our crede. yet he confesseth it an article of our faith. HERE. Ye but not necessary to be beleued (he saith) vnder payne of damnation. CATH. Whether it be vnder that paine or no; yet an article of our faith (as y trewth is in dede) he saith it is: And therfore say I, necessary to, for els it were but vaine and superfluous, which to beleue, were shame vnto vs, and dishonour to our faith, that it shulde conteine any such thing. HERE. Sir now I perceiue that ye do not take this, that Frith dooth say (not necessary) as he dooth meane it. CATH. How is that? HERE.

He meaneth it for indifferent and nothing els: for in the laste leafe of his boke saue one, his woordes thereof be these.

> I thinke many men wonder (he saith) how I can die in this article, seyng that it is no necessarie article of our faith: I graunt that neither parte is an article necessary to bee beleued vnder paine of damnacion, but leue it as a thinge indifferent, to thinke therin as god shal instill in euery mans mynde, and that neither part condemne other for this matter, but each receiue other in brotherly loue.

Here you may perceiue that he meaneth by this woorde, not necessary, nothing els but indifferencie. CATH. I can the thanke, it is a place well pieke out: wherin firste, consider vpon what request he maketh his graunte. And after that, when he saieth, I leue it as a thinge indifferente, tell me what meaneth he, by this same woorde, it: saiyng I leue it. HERE. He meaneth the same that goeth before, when he saith, neither parte is an article necessary. &c. CATH. Then the sence of his woords must nedes be this, that he leaueth it, that is to say, neither parte, as a thing indifferent: wherfore if he leaue neither part, as a thing indifferent, then he leaueth both partes as thinges necessary: if he leue them both as thinges necessary, Then (to vnderstande the best therof) he leaueth the one parte necessarie to bee taken, and the other as necessarie to be forsaken, because the one is trew and the other false. And therfore, where is nowe his indifferencie become, that thou speakest of: or where is his principall purpose become, but by this cleane querthrowne: HERE. I neuer herd one, turne a mans tale as ye do. CATH. why so: HERE. Because ye haue brought it cleane out

of his meaning, and directly against the purpose he speaketh it for, as it dooth well apere: for ye maie bee sure, he ment not so. CA. How then? HE. His meanyng is this, that neither parte, that is to say, neither of both partes, is an article necessary to be beleued vnder paine of damnation, but each of them, is to bee lefte as a thing indifferent to thinke therin as god shall instill in euery mans mynde. CATH. And is this, his very meaning thinkest thou? HERE. It can bee none otherwise? CATH. Then this indifferencie he meaneth not to be of neither part: But to be of both parts. HERE. What els? CATH. Which both are they? HE. Both his part and yours. HERE. His and ours, are cleane contrary. HERE. That is plaine. CATH. And euen therfore so plaine is this, that the one is trew, and the other false. HERE. That can not be denied. CATH. Therfore this must nedes be graunted, that here he leaueth plaine, both trewth and falshed at libertee, to bee taken or forsaken, euen together indifferently: and in the ende knitteth vp the knot, with the request of a brotherly loue, to bee had betweene them. Wherfore hast thou herde of suche a stickler betweene trewth and falshed as this is? who wolde venture so arduous a matter, but he alone? how be it, his courage was suche, that when he sawe betweene trewth and falshed, that is to say betweene god and the diuell, so great a controuersie, as yet was neuer at reste, he thinking therin to winne his spurres, wold nedes as a man indifferent, take vp the matter betweene them, and make them shake handes, with a brotherly loue. But yet because his indifferencie was in this matter suche, as did put no difference betweene those parties which are

of so great and mete difference that is possible to be, God wold therfore in no wise haue him of his side, but refused him so cleane, that he had ben yet, as a masterlesse vacabund, if he had not ben taken into seruice of the other side. HERE. What sir me thinke ye talke your pleasure now at large. CATH. In very deede no more at large, then thoccasion therof doth iustly require: for without question he was farre to parciall of the wrong side, to supple trewth and falshed together, with the streite narowe yoke of indifferencie: he had forgotte the gospell, wherin trewth it selfe doth say, qui non est mecum, contra me est: That is to say, he that is not with me, is against me: wherin we finde no meane alowed. Neuertheless although it be impossible for this same, with me, and against me, to ioygne together by any meane in dede, yet frith not therwith content, wold nedes thrust in no lesse then euen indifferencie, as a meane betwene them for all that, and so, couple them together according to his fantasie. But how he sped withall, somewhat thou seest, and more thou shalte: for what if I lay to his charge, that he doth here impute vnto God, thynstilling as well of falshed, as of trewth into mens mindes? HERE. Ie shall not skyll what ye lay to his charge, so ye proue it not in deede.

What. 12.

Cap. 28.

CATH. Let me see how thou canst herin defende him. For doth he not say, I leue it as a thing indifferente, to thinke therin as God shall instill in euery mans mynde? HERE. So he sayth, but what of that? CATH. Doest thou not see it plaine in those wordes, that he imputeth to God the instilling of that into euery mans mynde, whether he meaneth by this worde, therin-

And

And againe that he meaneth by this woꝛde, therin, none other, but together each part, both his and ours whereof he speaketh: and those partes of his and ours are so contrary, that the one must nedes be trew and the other false: wherfoꝛe he doth (I say) impute vnto god, thinstilling of these two partes in euery mans minde, as well the one as the other: so that he will haue God thinstillar as well of falshed, as of trewth. HERE. Tushe sir this is to farre wyde. CATH. Wherfoꝛe? HERE. Because it nother doth, noꝛ yet can follow so: foꝛ the sence of his woꝛdes is this. I leue it (he saieth) as a thing indifferent to thinke therin, that is to say, in eache parte, as god shall instill in euery mans mynde, that is to say, as God shall reuele vnto them, which parte hath the trewth, and which hath not. CATH. Thou saiest much foꝛ hym, and as much as may be saide: But yet it will not holde: foꝛ with his indifferencie, he hath pꝛouided to muche to the contrary: As it maie somewhat apere by these woꝛdes that he saith,

As god shall instill in euery mans minde.

He saith not in some mens mindes. But he saieth in euery mans minde. And the trewth of this matter (as he holdeth him selfe) God dooth not instill in euery mans minde: wherfoꝛe his meaning must nedes be of that instilling, which dooth reach and extende farder then trewth, oꝛ els it muste nedes come shoꝛt of euery mans minde. wherfoꝛe he doth here impute vnto god, the instilling of moꝛe then trewth, whiche can be none other but falshed. HERE. Sir I dooe meruaile to here you speake, foꝛ Frith doth not here meane, euery man generally, as ye take him: but he meaneth

euery man specially, as in whom, god shall instill the trewth of this matter, and no farther. CATH. He is much beholding vnto the: for he could say no better for him selfe. But yet it will not helpe: for the very same, that he calleth here indifferent, is nother more nor lesse, but euen the same, that he leaueth to gods instilling in euery mans minde. And that is plaine to be both the part? of his belieke and ours, in this article of the holy sacramente, wherof the one is trew, and the other false. And those two part? doth he so glew together with indifferencie, to the intent they shuld so go and be taken together inseperably, that he wold not say, I leue them as thinges indifferent, but saith, I leaue it as a thing indifferent, putting them both together in the singular numore as one. And so referreth, it to gods instilling in euery mans minde, not the one, or the other distinctiuely, but euen ioyntly both together, according to his owne saiyng indifferently: Wherfore why may I not say, (as I said) that he doth referre vnto God thinstillinge as well of falshed as of trewth in euery mans minde, when therin he doth so knit and wrapp them both together with his indifferencie, and that in the singular numbre, that we can not by his owne wordes, deuide or plucke them asonder? HERE. I dare say, for all this, ye do not thinke your selfe, that euer he ment, god to be thinstiller of any falshed in any mans mind. CATH. How shulde we know his meaning but by his saiyng? his saiyng, doth shew and leade vs, to this meaninge. And therfore what woldest thou haue more? HERE. Yet I will not belene, that he ment to referre thinstilling of trewth and falshed both vnto god, with any suche indifferencie as ye speake of. CATH.

Then

Then thou muſte needes graunt, that he ment it rather of the one, then of the other: or els onely of the one, and not of the other. HERE. What els? CATH. If we vnderſtande him, to referre vnto god, thinſtilling rather of the one then of the other, or onely of the one, and not of the other. Then becauſe the one parte is his, and the other is ours, We muſt therfore nedes vnderſtand him, to referre vnto god, the inſtillinge rather of his parte, then of ours, or els onely of his parte and not of ours, becauſe he leaning to his owne parte, and not to ours, wolde nedes preferre his owne before ours. Wherfore becauſe his parte hath the falſhed, and ſo hath not ours, whiche hath the trewth, and ſo hath not his, it muſt needes folowe, that he referreth vnto god thinſtilling rather of falſhed then of trewth, or els only of the falſhed and not of the trewth. Therfore he leaueth and refereeth vnto god, thinſtilling other of both partes (according to his owne ſaiyng) indifferently, or els rather of the one parte, then of the other leaning not euen eaqually, or els only of his owne parte, and not of the other euen wholl perfially, for one of the three, it muſt nedes be, & yet take of them which thou wilt, this haſt thou ſene, what folowеth therof. HE. Sir I ſee that, folowe therof, which is to badde, to be gathered of any mans meaning. CATH. Whether it be or no, yet it doth and muſt nedes procede of his ſaiyng. And therfore thou maieſt well perceiue, that it is not ſo badde, but he was as madde, to take vpon him, to play the parte of ſuche an indifferent ſtickler, betwene trewth and falſhed, as wolde nedes perſwade ſuche a brotherly loue to be had betwene them, as neither of them ſhulde condemne other, but reſerue (he ſaith) each

sthers infirmitee to god: wherin also it appereth plaine, that he wold haue here the infirmitee of falshed, which is of thone side, reserued to god: Therfore what he meaneth by that, or how it soundeth in thine eare, I say no more, but this is he, which vnder pretence of his dewtie to beleue the. xii. veritees of the Crede, doth denie his dewty of beleefe in al the veritees of the whole scripture beside. Also this is he, that pretendeth to beare with vs in the trewth of our beleefe, to thintent he wolde haue vs beare as much with him, in the falshed of his beleefe. moreouer this is he, which doth say we may beleue that, whiche he him selfe doth say is false, and yet he him selfe wil not beleue that, which both he & we do say is trew: for we say it is an article of our feith, and euen so saith he: how be it he holdeth it indifferent to beleue or not beleue, but so do not we. And therfore he wil not beleue it one whit, till we do both agree, which he hath brought so nere the point, that now it wil neuer be. Cap. 29.

HERE. Well sir, ye do but dally with me now: how be it, if he were liuyng as he is not, and might answere for him selfe, he wold perchance answere ye otherwise and farre better then I can. CA. He wolde if he could, but yet wolde I appose him for al that, in one cause more, why he did thus diuide al the other veritees of scripture from those. xii. of the Crede? HE. Is there an other cause therof yet? CA. ye that there is. HE. I pray you what is that? CA. In the last leafe of his boke, his owne word doth well declare, which are euen these.

> There are many veritees (he saieth) which are no such articles of our feith.

HE. Is this all? CA. May not so? But first what articles meaneth he, by these, no such? HE. No such as

be

be of our Crede. CATH. Well saide. And what veritees dooth he meane here, that maie be no suche articles? HERE. All the other veritees of scripture. CATH. Then here his woordes againe, with those that folowyeth, and therin let them be iudge. for

There are (he saith) many veritees whiche yet maie bee no suche articles of our feithe. It is trewe that I laie in yrons, when I wrote this. how be it I wolde not receiue this trewthe for an article of our feithe: for you maie thinke the contrarie without all ieoperdie of damnation:

Nowe consider all this well together, and thou maiest soone perceiue, that this same exaumple of his imprisonment, dooth clerely shewe, that he meaneth not here, by these same veritees that he speaketh of, any veritees of scripture, but the veritees of all other thynges, whiche veritees in general, with the veritee of his imprisonment inspect all, he bryngeth for example, how he wolde haue vs take all the veritees of scripture saue twelue. For as the veritee of his imprisonment, maie be no suche article of our feithe, as those be of our Crede, Euen so after the same sorte, wolde he haue all those other veritees of scripture, to be no such articles of our feithe nother: But the veritee of his imprisonment, and all other of that sorte beside, are not onely no suche, but vtterly no articles of our feithe in dede, wherfore no more wolde he haue all the veritees of scripture, scantly those twelue excepte of the Crede: And yet before this, he lefte those other veritees of scripture as articles indifferent: But now he will haue them, other none articles of our feithe at all, or els the veritees of all other thynges, to bee articles of our feithe euen as well as thei: Therfore what wonder is it, though he thus diuide all the other veritees of scripture, as of an other kinde from the veritees of the Crede,

when thei be with him of no moze eſtimacion, then be all ſuch other veritees, as (foz example) the ſteple of Paules is higher then the croſſe in chepe: And becauſe the veritee therof is none article of our feithe, foz all it is a veritee in dede: Therfoze by his plaine exaumple, ne moze wolde he haue all the veritees of ſcripture, ſauing onely thoſe expreſſed in the Crede: were not a man happie thinkeſt thou, to mete with ſuche a doctour, to teche him his feithe: dooeſt thou not perceiue the mighty power and ſtrengthe of this veritee, whiche he wolde ſo faine ouerthzowe, when it geueth him ſo ſhamefull faules, in euery wicked wile, that he dooth attempte againſt it:

> It is treiwe (he ſaith) that I laie in yzons when I wzote this: how be it I wolde not receiue that trewthe foz an article of our feithe.

And yet without faile when he ſaid ſo, he went moze nere to make it one, then he was ware of him ſelfe: foz he went ſo nere it, that he bzought it within one wozde of it: In ſo much, that if he had put in (as the trewth required) but this ſame wozde (wozthely) moze then he did, & ſaid, it is treiw that I lay wozthely in yzons whē I wzot this, without queſtion, it had ben then ſo nere an article of our feith in dede, That who ſo euer wolde not beleue it (knowing the matter) thei could not be, but in great ieoperdie of damnacion. Foz doubtles thoſe that thinke hym unwozthily pziſoned, knowing the cauſe why, be of the ſame moſt damnable opinion, that he was of him ſelfe, god of his great mercy graunt them ſone to amende it: foz how damnable that opinion is, it maie well and ſufficiently apere, and it were but by theſe his reaſons (as to ſome thei ſeme) which we haue diſcuſſed hitherto alredie: how be it, god willynge, in the reſidewe yet to come, it ſhall be

be no doubte to the moſt affectionate frend, that he hath: onely thoſe excepte, whiche gate it by the ſame meane, and holdeth it by the ſame tenour, that he came by it and helde it him ſelfe. HERE. Well ſir, if there bee no better meanyng in Frithes woordes, then ye haue declared hitherto, I meruaile greatly, that euer he wolde ſpeake them as he dooth. CATH. Doeſt thou meruaile at that? HERE. I can not chooſe. CATH. Then why doeſt thou not meruaile at an other thyng, which is a thouſande tymes more meruellous then that is: HE. What is that? CATH. That euer ſuche a number wolde folowe him as there hath done, and take him for ſo plaine, beyng ſo deceitfull: Take him ſo ſimple, being ſo craftie: Take him ſo wiſe, being ſo fooliſh: Take him ſo trewe, beyng ſo falſe. And of that numbre, ſo many welthie, as men dooth deme: ſo many wiſe, as them ſelfes dooth wene: ſo many politike, as thei ſeme: and yet ſpie not his falſhed in all this time, what meruell maie be compared vnto it? for where as the wiſedom of one, ſhuld ouerthrow the fooliſhnes of many, here the wiſdome of many, is clene ouerthrowen with the fooliſhnes of one: And alſo where as the falſhed of one, ſhuld geue place to the trewth of many, here hath the trewth of many, cleane giuen place, to the falſhed of one: who is able ſufficiently to deſcribe the wonderfulnes of this matter? Wherfore if thou fall to meruailynge, meruaile at this, whiche maie bee called a meruaile alone: And therfore becauſe, in conſideracion of our longe talke, it is nowe time to drawe to an ende. Remember that I haue declared vnto thee, although not all, nor halfe nother, but yet enough and enough, for thee to perceiue

what

what maner of foundacion it is, wherin Frith boſteth and glozieth ſo greatly, that he is not aſhamed, in repzoche of maiſter Mooze, and anauncynge hym ſelfe, to ſaie (as I tolde thee befoze) theſe woozdes.

» Whis am I right ſuer of (he ſaith) that he neuer touched » the foundacion, that my treatiſe was builded vpon. And » therfoze ſith my foundacion ſtandeth ſo ſuer and inuinci» ble (foz els I thinke verily he wolde ſoze haue laboured to » haue vndermined it) I wyll therupon builde a little » moze. ꝛc.

And againe:

» Whis was the foundacion (he ſaith) of my firſte treatiſe, » that he hath lefte vnſhaken, whiche is a great argument » that it is very trewe. Foz els his pzegnant wit coulde » not haue paſſed it ſo cleane ouer, but wolde haue aſſailed » it with ſome ſophiſticall cauellacion. ꝛc.

Howe falſe a riar he ſheweth hym ſelfe herein, I take none other, but euen hym ſelfe to witneſſe in the. 56. lefe of his booke, where he reciteth maiſter Moozes owne ſaiynge in theſe woozdes.

»» God fozbid (ſaith maiſter Mooze) that any man ſhoulde »» be the moze pzone andreadie to beleue this yonge man in »» this great matter, becauſe he ſaith in the beginnyng, that »» he wyll bzyng al men to a concozde and a quietnes of con»» ſcience. Foz he bzingeth men to the woꝛſte kynde of qui»» etnes that maie be deuiſed, when he telleth vs as he doth, »» that euery man in this matter, maie without perell be»» leue which wat he luſt. Euery man mai in euery matter, »» without any counſaile, ſoone ſet him ſelfe at reſte, if he »» luſte to take that waie, and to beleue as he luſt him ſelfe, »» and care not how. But and if that waie had bene ſuer, »» ſaint Paule wolde neuer haue ſhewed, that many were »» in perell of ſickenes and death to, foz lacke of diſcernyng »» reuerently the bodie of our Lozde in that ſacramente, »» when thei came to receiue hym:

Now ſaieſt thou nowe? dooth maiſter Mooze leue this

lyers

lyers false foundacion vntouched and vnshaken, as he shamefully saith and lyeth that he doth? who, maie saie moze vnto it, in so fe we woozdes? And yet as though it were nothynge ss, I wolde not haue thee fozget, how the false rainarde glozieth therin as though he had wonderfull iuske, and good cause why so to dooe, how bee it, I dooe not greatly meruaile therat. Foz so muche ashamed is he to lie, as moste honeste men are, to saie the trewthe: And therfoze with this I wyll leue thee nowe, and bede thee farewell.

Cap. 30.

HERE. Mary syz a faire farewell in dede. CATH. Why what eileth it? HE. What shal I nede to tel you, if we parte nowe, and leue the matter thus? CA. What remedie? foz I can tary no longer at this time: HERE. Then I pzaie you tell me, when we shall mete agayne: CATH. Mete againe? why art thou not well yet? HERE. Well yet quotha? Mary sir all this is nothynge to that I looke foz. CATH. what is that? HERE. I looke foz the scriptures, the olde holy doctours, and the natural reasons, that Frith bringeth foz the pzoke of his pzincipall purpose againste the reall pzesence of Chzistes veray bodie in the sacrament, whiche purpose he buildeth vpon this foundacion. These thyngs I looke foz, to see, what ye can saie to them: oz whether ye be able to auoide them oz not. CATH. I dooe plainly confesse, that I am not able in dede. Foz who can auoide holy scriptures, olde holy doctours, oz naturall reason other? HERE. Then if ye can not auoide them, ye must nedes graunte, that Frith hath his purpose. CATH. Naie softe, thou must pardon me therof. Foz although I can not auoide the holy scriptures, noz yet the olde holy

doctours, that he bringeth for him: yet I can wel auoide his fals vnderstandynge of them. And what by them, hath he gotten then? And as for his naturall reasons that thou speakest of, I am well able to proue, that they bee in the name of them, nothynge els, but a sorte of deceueable sophistications: wherin he plaieth as one did (synce I maie remember) beynge aboute to steale ware out of a shoppe in London, and perceiuyng that he was spied and lyke to bee taken, he to goe, and diuers after hym, cryinge stoppe the theefe stoppe the theefe, and he herynge that, cried euen so lykewise hym selfe, as faste as they did, by reason wherof, suche as met hym in the waie, nothynge suspectynge hym, looked so muche after an other, whiche as thei thought shoulde bee before hym, that he by that meanes gat to saint Martyns, and deceiued them all. And so lykewise this wily sophister Frith, goynge aboute to steale from vs the trewthe of our feithe with his deceiueable sophistications, vnder the name and pretence of naturall reasons, and fearyng therwith to be taken, had none other shifte nor hope to scape, (but as I tolde thee before) to exclame and crie, beware of sophisters, beware of sophisters, thinkynge vtterly therby, that no man wolde suspecte hym to bee any of that sorte: and yet in comparison of hym, there is none but he alone: wherof thou haste had a metely good proofe alredie: HERE. What proofe so euer I haue had alredie, I wolde here the proofe of that whiche I nowe desyre: CATH. Thou shalte: HERE. Yea but when? CATH. Euen when thou wilte thy selfe: HERE. That, by my wyll, shall bee euen to morowe, while this that I haue herde to daie, is somewhat freshe in memorie. CA. Content, HERE.

Then

Then where shall I mete with you? CATH. In no place better then here: HE. What time? before noone or after? CA. Maie it pleaseth an after noones worke I maie saie to thee: for the whole daie longe, I suppose were littell enough. And therfore come by nyne or ten of the clocke at the fardest. For one thynge I will tell thee before, thou neuer herdest suche a worke, of an heretike since thou were borne, as thou shalt here of him declared in this prose whiche thou requirest. HE. What wors then I haue herde to daie? CA. Be thou iudge thy selfe when thou herest it: HE. Well sir, I will not faile the time apointed, for I shall now thinke longe till it come. CA. Therfore I will bede thee farewell till then: HE. No sir not yet, for I will bringe you homewarde. CA. That shall not nede: HE. Yes sir, for halfe your waie and mine is all one: CA. Then come on, let vs goe together for so farre: HE. That is my desyre. And therfore is it not as good we be talkyng by the waie for the time, as ought els? CA. Yes, I am verey well pleased therwithal, if thou hast any thyng els to saie. HE. Yes mary sir, and that is this: I wolde faine knowe by what reason you can proue, ý this same article, which we haue bene aboute all this while, is one of them, that we are bownde of necessitee to beleue vnder peine of damnacion: Ye haue hitherto inueied againste Frith, for holdyng the contrarie, but yet haue ye doone nothynge to the probacion therof your selfe: for it is two thynges to proue Frithes opinion false, and to proue yours trewe: CATH. Well, although the probacion of the trewthe, can not haue a verey apte and conuenient place, before the falsitee bee cleane reselled and throughly put awaie, and that in the whole, as it is not nowe, but

in parte, yet all voide of thy requeſt, I wyll not leue thee, becauſe I perceiue thee, ſomewhat deſyrous to here of the matter: And therfore while Frithes opinion is this, that it is an article of no neceſſitee to bee beleued, and our feithe is plaine to the contrarie, the one parte, or the other, muſte nedes be trewe: wherfore becauſe the one parte, or the other muſte nedes be trewe, and betwene trewthe and falſhed there can be no meane, it can not be auoided, but ſith the falſhed is founde of his ſyde: The trewthe muſte nedes remaine with vs. HERE. May ſir that folowеth not: for the falſhed that ye fynde with Frithe, is in his probacion and not in the thynge, which he goeth aboute to proue. For ye knowe right well, that a man maie miſſe in the probacion of a trew thynge ſometyme, and yet is not the thynge falſe, becauſe the probacion is not trewe. CATH. So maieſt thou excuſe euery falſhed, whiche any falſe harlot goeth aboute to proue trewe: for ſoone maieſt thou ſaie, that although he faile in his probacion, yet is the thynge that he wolde proue, trewe enough for all that, becauſe a man maie be deceiued in the probacion of a trew thynge. When in dede the faulſitee of a thynge, is ofte times more then halfe diſcloſed, by the falſitee of the probacion. And therfore although the manifeſte falſhed of Frithes probacions, doe not euen very apertly proue the falſhed of his opinion. Yet dooth it make at the leaſt, an ineuitable coniecture therof. And therfore euen as much for the trewth of our ſide: for what ſhall or maie we gather of this, that all the reaſons whiche he hath brought for his purpoſe, doth not only not proue his intent, but alſo draw after them ſuche odible conſequences, as euery good chriſten eare muſt nedes abhorre to here? what ſhall we

gather

gather (I say) of this, but that the mighty and inuincible trewth of the contrary part, will in no case suffre it selfe to be ouerthrowne. Furthermore, what wilt thou say, if Frith doe sufficiently proue our parte him selfe? HERE. That can not be, for all his whole purpose is vtterly to the contrary. CATH. I graunt the same, and yet marke him well. For he intendinge in dede to proue the contrary, maketh neuer a reason, but that (as I haue declared vnto the) it renneth vtterly euen as much against the necessitee of other necessary articles beside, as it doth against this, for which he did purpose it: and that were not possible, but because the like or the very same necessitee of beliefe, is as wel in this, as in them, and all one: for how shuld his reasons purposed only against the necessary belieue of this artitle, touch the necessary belieue of any other likewise, more thē they touch the light of the sonne, the heat of the fire and other like, being no more purposed against those other necessary articles, then against these thinges, but vtterly because those articles and this, be all of one sort, and of like necessitee to be beleued, and eache of these thinges, that is to say, the light of the sonne, and the heat of the fire, cleane of an other sort? For what reason so euer be brought against any thing, so farre it doth alway renne as the communitee of the thing, against which it is brought, doth extende, and no farther: As be it in case, that one were so madde, as to deny the immortalitee of thy soule, and wolde goe aboute to dispproue the same. Yet what so euer reasons he shuld make against it, without faile must nedes renne likewise, euen as well against the immortalitee of all other mens soules beside, as against thine, and that could not be, but because that same immortalitee is commune

and doth apperteine as well vnto thy soule as to theirs. Wherfore after the like maner, the cause why, that Frithes reasons doth renne, as well against the necessitee of other necessary articles, as it doth against the necessitee of this (for which they were purposed) is vtterly because, the very same necessitee of belieke, is commune and doth aperteine as well vnto this, as to them and all one: for els it were not possible for those reasons purposed but onely against this, to make any thing more against the necessitee of those other, then against (as I said) the light of the sonne, or any thing els beside. Therfore it must nedes folow, that this article, is of as great necessitee to be beleued, as any of the other is. wherfore because Frith wolde haue proued it indifferent and could not, he hath therfore now proued it necessary and wolde not. Wherwith content thy selfe, thou getteſt no more of me at this tyme. HERE. Yes I pray you sir, one thinge more, and then I will bid you farwell. CA. What is that? HERE. Mary sir I haue redde Frithes boke, I wene as often as euer did you, and yet could I neuer finde or perceiue such matter therin, as ye haue declared, and I meruaile greatly what shuld bee the cause therof: CATH. It is no meruaile at all: for doubtles if Frith had no more trewth, vertue, wit, and learning in thine opinion, then he had in his owne head, thou shuldeſt sone haue perceiued in his booke, a great deale more, then I haue shewed the. And that shalt thou proue most trew, if thou do but withdraw thine opinion and affection from him. HERE. Trow ye so? CATH. There is no doubt of that. HERE. Well sir, here is my way now, and therfore I will trouble you no longer at this tyme. CATH. Then farewell tyll to morow.

row. HERE. God be with you sir. CATH. And with the to. HERE. At. ix. or x. of the clocke ye say. CATHOLICVS. What els? HERETICVS. I will not faile you.

Faultes escaped in the printyng.

Leafe.	Side.	Line.	Faultes.	Corrected.
37.	2.	15.	anyē of	any of
38.	2.	6.	as	bs
40.	2.	6.	whtch	which

IMPRINTED AT LONDON
IN FLETESTRETE IN
THE HOVS OF THO-
mas Berthelet.

Cum priuilegio ad impri-
mendum solum.


LUCRECIA ROMANA
THOM AS
BERTHELETVS